

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

BIBLICAL and theological science in this country has been greatly enriched by the publication of studies which were originally presented to the world as a course of lectures delivered on famous foundations. To name only two, the publication of the Bampton and the Gifford Lectures is always eagerly awaited by those who are genuinely interested in the progress of theological thought. The Schweich Lectures are not yet so well known, and their sphere is a more restricted one—they are confined to some aspect of Biblical archæology; but the twenty-three volumes which have already appeared constitute an imposing series, and to any real student of the Bible, and especially of the Old Testament, they are indispensable.

The latest addition to the series is, in a way, unique. It is entitled *Ancient Hebrew Social Life and Custom as indicated in Law, Narrative, and Metaphor* (Milford; 6s. net); the lectures were delivered in 1931 by the late Canon R. H. KENNETT, and their publication has been supervised by Professor F. C. BURKITT. Their uniqueness consists in this, that, while earlier volumes have sometimes travelled beyond Israel for their main theme or their illustrative material—for example, to Egypt, Babylon, the Arabs, the Samaritans, the Hittites—this volume confines the discussion rigidly to Israel and the Old Testament, leaving out of account, on the one hand, modern customs, and, on the other, discoveries of archæological investigation.

At least that was the lecturer's aim; fortunately he has not been entirely faithful to it. For out of his ample store of knowledge of both ancient and modern customs he lets occasional side-lights fall on his central theme. For example, in illustrating Nathan's parable, in which the lamb drinks out of the poor man's cup, he tells us that 'even to-day guests who partake of the courteous Bedouin hospitality may be offered milk from the vessel out of which he has seen the goat drinking a few minutes before.'

He also offers many modern analogies. If the witch of Endor had a fatted calf in her house, 'a like state of affairs has lasted in Irish cabins till recent times.' The mixed provender referred to in Is 30²⁴ suggests that grape-skins, etc., used in the making of wine, were sometimes mixed with the provender, 'somewhat as brewers' "grains" are nowadays given to cows.' Illustrating the dances of the girls at Shiloh by the May Day dances which innocently perpetuate a pagan rite, he remarks that 'there is a strong probability that both the Shiloh maidens and the Thanet little girls were alike celebrating something that did not originate in mere *joie de vivre*.' On the difficulty of ascertaining by etymology the exact meaning of the various items enumerated in Is 3¹⁸⁻²³ of a Hebrew woman's articles of dress and toilet, he facetiously comments thus: 'It would be interesting to see the conclusions at which an expert etymologist would arrive, if with nothing to guide him but etymology

he attempted to interpret a catalogue of an Oxford Street or Regent Street drapery firm!' Again, 'the châtelaine of a mansion, so charmingly described in the Book of Proverbs (31), would have stood no nonsense, nor would any one have attempted it with her.'

The aim of the lecturer was to sketch the life of Hebrew men and women from birth to the grave, and to give an account of the various activities in which they might engage. This aim has been achieved with extraordinary success and on the basis of an almost incredibly minute acquaintance with every detail and allusion, however incidental, in the Old Testament. There must be many hundreds of references in the footnotes which justify the statements in the text, but they are woven together with almost miraculous skill into a continuous whole. Here are two illustrations of the skilful combination to which we refer. We are told that 'a few fortunate people have wells in their courtyards. The water from such wells appears to have been drawn by means of a rope and pulley.' The first statement is supported by 2 S 17^{18f.}, and the second by Ec 12⁶. As a second illustration may be cited the statement that arrows which were sharpened and rubbed smooth were, at least sometimes, poisoned. The first two statements rest on Is 5²⁸ and 49², and the third on Job 6⁴. Only a consummate master could have woven together so skilfully allusions so distant and disparate from one another.

The tabulated subjects of the lectures, numerous as they are, really give little idea of the wealth of information they convey. The first lecture, while professedly confined to birth, early years, and marriage, deals, for example, with naming, circumcision, weaning, education, human sacrifices, betrothal, concubinage. The second lecture, besides the intimate discussion of houses, furniture, food, meals, banquets, clothing, mourning, and death, deals in detail with the fire and water supply, beds, tables, pots, cups, lamps, the grinding of corn, milk, baking, vegetables, wine, oil, sandals, hairdressing, music, dancing, and sundry other items. The themes which come up for discussion

in the third lecture, which deals chiefly with occupations, are hunting, agriculture, land division, workers in wood and metal, goldsmiths and silversmiths, mechanics, barbers, fullers, perfumers, physicians and apothecaries, jewellers and workers in precious stones, and administration of justice and law. The lectures together constitute a most vivid transcript of Hebrew life, its training and sport, its trades and professions, its habits and customs: their purpose is not to raise or settle problems, but to furnish information and thus to revivify that ancient life.

We are told, for example, that the reason why *seven* children were commonly regarded as the maximum number that a woman might be expected to bear is connected with the long period of weaning which was habitual in the ancient Hebrew world. We are reminded that though little is said, more is implied, about mother love, and to the four passages given in proof might be added the immortal story of Rizpah in 2 S 21. Those—if there be any—who still think that Jephthah did not contemplate human sacrifice as an expression of his gratitude for victory are justly reminded that 'fatted calves do not ordinarily go out of the door of a house to meet a returning conqueror.'

On the vexed question of writing it would be possible to differ from Dr. KENNETT. He thinks that the presence of a *sôphêr*, or 'secretary,' at the court may be reasonably taken as suggesting that reading and writing were not necessarily royal accomplishments. But the modern State, too, has its secretaries, home and foreign, whose existence, however, would hardly justify the corresponding inference. Reading and writing, if not necessarily royal accomplishments, would be still less universal accomplishments, and it is very doubtful, according to Dr. KENNETT, whether most children learned to write. But the allusion in Jg 8¹⁴—a passage to which he refers, but to which perhaps he hardly allows sufficient weight—to a lad, caught quite casually, who was able to *write down* certain names (with inexcusable conservatism, the R.V. retaining the wholly misleading translation 'describe'), seems to point to a more general acquaintance

with the art of writing than it has been usual to accept for that early period. Quite delightful, however, and far from improbable, is the suggestion that the oft-quoted words 'precept upon precept, line upon line' (Is 28¹⁰), cleverly rendered by Whitehouse 'law on law, saw on saw,' may be intended to recall a spelling-lesson at school: thus *šadhe* ו *waw* spell *šu* שׁ; *ḥoph* ו *waw* spell *ḥu* ח—these words suggesting a connexion with the words for 'filth' and 'vomit' in v.⁸.

For once we have a book on the Old Testament which can be read with ease, profit, and pleasure, by one who has not even a bowing acquaintance either with Hebrew or Old Testament criticism. True, there are one or two points of which the student of Hebrew will take note—that *gibbor* is not necessarily a warrior but may at times mean 'a gentleman,' and that *naḥal* does not mean 'to inherit.' Practically the only critical reference in the book is one from which we feel inclined to dissent: it is this—that 'Samuel's rebuke of the people for asking to have a king is clearly the work of one who perhaps belonged to the age of Nehemiah, and who desired that the government should be in the name of the priestly class.' But the book—which is furnished, by the way, with an elaborate and admirable index of both passages and subjects—postulates, as we have said, no knowledge of criticism or chronology. Though Hebrew life was modified in the course of centuries, as all life must be, both by internal progress and by the impact of alien influences, there is about it a curious and undeniable continuity: and the elements of which that 'fairly persistent culture' was composed are here set forth as only a scholar who was complete master of this material could exhibit them.

Twenty-two years before the delivery of these lectures Dr. KENNETT had already, in his capacity as Schweich lecturer, delivered a course on the Book of Isaiah, in which his fresh and unconventional criticism was applied to some of the most difficult literary and historical problems on the field of the Old Testament. It is all to the good that this later book, in virtue of its broad human interest,

will appeal beyond the scholar to the man in the street and in the pew.

'Three Essential Elements in All Religion' is the heading of a useful section of President W. Douglas MACKENZIE's recent volume entitled *The Christ of the Christian Faith*.

The first element is the sense of human need or the desire for some form of good, physical, moral, or spiritual; the second is the conception of some object Divine and super-human who satisfies that need; the third is the attitude and conduct of man by means of which it is believed that the desire for good is met by the God who is conceived of as its possessor and dispenser. The grade of each religion, it is added, depends upon the degree of clearness or crudeness, of ripeness or unripeness, with which those elements are emphasized and developed. This is especially evident in the case of Buddhism, Muhammadanism, and Christianity.

First of all, these three religions have sprung from certain views of the supreme need of human nature which must be satisfied. This may be viewed negatively, in relation to evil, as deliverance from suffering, sin, and death; and positively, in relation to good, as the attainment of a blessed and eternal life in union with God. Buddhism is defective on both sides; so also is Islam. Christianity presents a view of sin and holiness, of deliverance and perfection, of man's present relation to Nature and the life to come, which obviously surpasses the other two, correcting, supplementing, and sublimating them from point to point.

In the second place, each of these religions presents us with a definite view of the function which its founder exercised in his effort to satisfy the needs which have been described. He must be viewed as exemplar, or prophet, or redeemer, or as a combination of two or all three of these. Buddha was primarily an exemplar of the process of enlightenment, though later Buddhism tended to enlarge his authority into that of a prophet,

and his experience into that of a redeemer. Muhammad was primarily a prophet, inspired with definite and direct messages from God. Christianity views Jesus Christ as the direct and perfect exemplar of the character of God the Father, as the full revealer of religious truth, and also as the redeemer whose personal experience, especially in His death on the Cross and in His resurrection, changed the moral relations of God and man.

In the third place, each of these religions has come to believe in its founder as one who stood in definite and superhuman relations with the eternal God, though Buddha himself was wholly concerned with a system of ethical culture for the attainment of deliverance, and Muhammad claimed only to be the prophet of Allah. From the first, however, Christianity believed its Founder to be a superhuman being, one who had become incarnate. As thus an incarnate, Divine personality, He exercised all the functions of exemplar, revealer, and redeemer, distinctly and with ideal completeness.

It is of the utmost importance, adds Dr. Douglas MACKENZIE, that we should not attempt to minimize the astounding nature of this central and supreme feature of the Christian Faith. We gain neither the respect of the 'modern mind,' nor the peace of our own hearts, if we shrink from seeing in this the supreme miracle of human history and the essence of Christianity.

'Sharing' is the watchword of all systems to-day, political and religious alike. It is said that in Oxford the undergraduates are divided into two bodies, the Communists and the 'Oxford Groupers,' and it is this watchword that they have in common. In his suggestive and eminently charitable book, *Sharing* (S.C.M.; 1s. net), Mr. T. W. PYM, who is known favourably by his contributions to religious psychology, uses the word in the religious sense. He does not belong to the Oxford Group. His attitude to the Group is friendly but critical. With his convictions, and his religious attitude, he could not very well be a member (a term the groupers reject). His idea of sharing is wider than theirs.

Mr. PYM believes in sharing, but does not accept the claim of any particular method to be exclusive and universally valid. This, he admits, exposes him to criticism from two sides, the Anglo-Catholic and the Group. The Anglo-Catholic insists that Confession and Absolution are a necessary part of the true Christian practice for every churchman. The grouper regards this as too individual and secretive a form of sharing. It ought to be social and public. But, on the other hand, the Anglo-Catholic deplores the insufficiency of the Group teaching about Divine forgiveness and about the place of authority in religion. Their attitude to each other is not so much hostile; it is rather an objection to the incompleteness of the other. And both would reject the word 'method' as applied to their practice. To the Anglo-Catholic the confessional is part of the Faith. To the grouper sharing is just primitive Christianity.

The important thing, however, is what they have in common, that all alike do find in some form of sharing a road to the heart of Jesus Christ. It is to this 'underlying intention' that Mr. PYM directs his reflections. He distinguishes three forms of sharing—sharing with one, Group sharing and Team sharing. The most common form of sharing is that of one person with one other. The person who shares does so because by 'making a clean breast of it' he may rid himself of an obsession or receive counsel about temptation. He feels the need to unburden himself to some one who will listen with sympathy and who will not 'leak'. The benefit is, in a word, liberation, and this benefit may not necessarily be religious. Merely to share something may be a tremendous relief. It tends to straighten out the tangle in one's own mind just to state the thing to some other person, even if no particular advice or opinion is forthcoming. One has got the thing 'off his chest.'

At the same time it must be firmly asserted that people who do not share in this way are not necessarily shirking. There are lots of people who by temperament and by conviction are quite free from any desire to share anything of their inner life. They do not need to share with any other

person in order to achieve release from sin or assurance that God's love includes them. Moreover, for some people this would be positively undesirable because injurious. Reserve is not in their case a temptation or a bad habit or a bit of selfishness; it is sometimes a divinely given protection of the personality; it is for some a curtain which no one else has any right to force aside. And it must be added that many sound people are repelled by the facility some others have in talking about themselves and their 'awful past.' What needs to be recognized is that the method is wholly inappropriate to certain people.

With regard to Group sharing, Mr. PYM very generously defends the Oxford Group practice from some of the commonest criticisms levelled at it. It is sometimes dismissed, for example, as an instance of 'mass psychology.' But even so, retorts Mr. PYM, why should not mass psychology be used in the interests of human redemption? Again, it is reported that sex matters form a quite disproportionate part of the experiences shared in public. But Mr. PYM has not found it to be so in an apparently extensive acquaintance with Group meetings. And, finally, the whole thing is condemned as 'over-emotional.' To which the answer given is that to condemn emotion is a brainless act; while if it is said that what is criticised is emotionalism, Mr. PYM has, on the contrary, found the Group meetings exceptionally free of it. The meetings were, he says, almost too 'matter-of-fact,' and he did not feel himself moved strongly at all.

Mr. PYM's sole criticism is that Group sharing is only wrong if it claims universal validity. There are people who have reached the desired religious blessing along another route, and to demand of them that they should adopt the Group way is to ask something like hypocrisy from them. Others may testify before us, but happily we have been *there* before them and along perhaps another road. And when this practice tends to be standardized and becomes a kind of fashion in a parish the disadvantages are obvious. 'I know a place where at a meeting for common sharing of sin the parochial clergy most simply and humbly testified to the

value of the practice in making them realise their own want of fellowship. Their parishioners, however, may be excused for feeling as one said to me: "is it necessary to inform a parish-meeting that, though ordained ministers in the Church of Christ, they needed the Oxford Group Movement to teach that elementary Christian charity which they require of lay people as a prime condition of receiving the Lord's Supper?"'

The Team sharing is on a different plane. It is the pooling of experiences, of plans for the future, of moral lessons learned. This kind of sharing may have a real educational value. In regard to methods of handling individual people, for example. This kind of practice is spreading largely because of its ascertained worth. That which was (or might have been) a Group for the sharing of sin becomes a team for the purpose of corporate evangelism. People describe how they were led to deal with awkward situations. And all such information is shared against the background of frank admission by the sharer of his own mistakes. It must be added that the criticism which is freely and frankly interchanged is consciously subjected to the control of the Holy Spirit, and is therefore received humbly, good-temperedly, and with the intention to act on the advice given.

The rest of Mr. PYM's suggestive book is devoted to counsel which may help people in dealing with others who need direction or strengthening or liberation. Mr. PYM rightly insists that the clergy are not sufficiently equipped for spiritual direction. He thinks that many lay people might exercise this kind of ministry with good results if they were properly trained. In particular, he considers that the right type of women might be exceedingly useful in such matters, though he admits as a simple matter of fact that women are decidedly unwilling to 'share' with other women. They would, as a rule, far rather 'share' with the proper kind of man. On such matters, and on others of a cognate kind, Mr. PYM has much that is useful to say. Indeed, his whole essay is wise and kind and helpful, and ought to be read and considered both by clergy and by lay workers of all kinds.

The Message of the Church on the Political Issues of the Day.¹

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D., NEW YORK.

I AM to speak of the message of the Church on the political issues of the day. From time immemorial that message has been given. From the day when an Emperor came to Canossa to kneel before a Pope and receive absolution, statesmen have been obliged to take note of the utterances of the religious conscience as voiced by its official representatives. It is not the Roman Catholic Church only that has claimed to speak on political issues. Protestants, with their high doctrine of the sanctity of the secular life, have been even more jealous of this right. I well remember on a former visit to England how I learnt that Dr. John Clifford, the Grand Old Man of the English Baptists, had gone to prison rather than pay a school tax of which he disapproved; and in my own country, the cleavages produced by the action of the Churches on the issues raised by the Civil War still leave their traces in a divided Presbyterianism. Coming to more recent times, the story of the Eighteenth Amendment is still contemporary history, and in the wider field of the struggle for disarmament, the Churches of the United States have played an honourable part.

The right of the Church to express a judgment on political matters is often challenged, most recently by a leading editorial in the *London Times*. The occasion was a resolution proposed for discussion at the forthcoming meeting of the London Diocesan Conference. Speaking of this resolution, in which the concern of the Church for the failures of the present social system was expressed, and its readiness affirmed to 'examine without fear or prejudice any proposals for a reconstruction of our social and economic life' (*London Times*, May 29, 1933) the writer censured the proposed action as dealing with matters *ultra vires*. Let the Bishops stick to their proper job of looking after their dioceses, and the priests confine themselves to the maintenance of the services in their parishes. Let them leave to the statesmen and the politicians the decision of questions that concern the national welfare.

It is a familiar note. We have heard it again and again; the more insistently, the closer the Churches' criticism comes to fundamental social

and political issues. Keep the Church out of politics. Let churchmen stick to religion, or at most to morals, and all will be well.

But it is just because the Church's business is morals and religion that it cannot leave politics alone. What political issue can you name that has not a moral aspect, and, if traced to its roots, will not lead straight to religion? The man whom Jesus came to save is not a composite creature, part body and part soul, so that the politician can look after his body while the priest takes care of his soul. He is one undivided personality, and, individual though he be, finds his true life only in right relations to his fellows. Inevitably, therefore, he is involved, and the Church which is concerned for his welfare must be involved, in all the complex social issues with which politics has to do.

It is no doubt true that even where the right of the Church to express political judgments is granted, it is not easy to determine just how it should be exercised. Churchmen themselves differ on the issues involved, and the more sincere and unselfish they are, the more acute will be their differences. What measure of agreement is necessary before the Church can speak as a Church, and how, even when that agreement is present, shall the needed utterance be made? Shall the Church speak through its official organs by deliverance of synod or assembly, or through independent and less formal bodies brought into existence for the purpose? When a decision has been reached as to the merits of the case, how far, and in what way should it be followed up by definite political action? These are questions on which there is room for honest difference of opinion, and where as a matter of fact such difference exists. How wide the difference may be is being brought vividly before us by recent events in Germany, where two radically different theories of the relation of Church and State are struggling for the mastery—the theory that the Church is in the last analysis the servant of the State, its agent for the execution of policies in the formation of which it has had no part, and which it opposes at its peril; and the theory which claims for the Church spiritual autonomy, and demands the right to obey conscience even if it involves conflict with the State.

It is therefore matter for encouragement that in

¹ An Address delivered at the Meeting of the Alliance of the Churches holding the Presbyterian System at Belfast, June 26, 1933.

many different quarters the theoretical questions involved in the relation of Church and State are being subjected to fresh investigation. In the United States a commission of representative scholars and churchmen appointed by the Federal Council has been carrying on for more than a year a study of the relation of Church and State, while the subject proposed for the next year's study of the Universal Council of Life and Work (the successor of the Stockholm Conference) is the Christian View of the Nation.

But while the scholars are carrying on their learned studies, the politicians are acting, and we find ourselves confronted with issues in the world to-day, both within the bounds of the nation and in the wider international sphere, on which immediate decisions are needed. We cannot wait till the scholars have finished; we must act now, or it will be too late.

This gives my subject its immediate practical importance. What I bring you to-day is not a scholar's contribution to an interesting academic discussion, but the effort of one who is facing definite practical responsibilities to arrive at principles which will help him to act promptly and effectively.

This at least we may take for granted at the outset: that if the Church is to act effectively, it must act on matters on which it is in fact agreed. Too often minority groups within the Church, animated by the best of motives, have proclaimed in the name of the Church programmes of social action which the bodies for which they claim to speak have repudiated. Such action can only discredit the cause of religion. Better a short step taken all together from which there is no retreat, than an advance position occupied only to be surrendered.

But are there indeed such points of agreement? Is not the Church itself so hopelessly divided that effective witness is impossible? If this be so, let us frankly confess it and have done with our hypocrisy, but do not let us assume that agreement is impossible till we have explored the possibilities which are open to us now.

I venture to suggest four principles as defining the field of existing agreement. Modest on the face of them, they have far-reaching implications, and if sincerely accepted and loyally acted on, would carry us a long way.

The first principle is this: That in dealing with the political issues which face us to-day, we are concerned not primarily with effects, but with causes. The second is this: That in dealing with these causes we should follow the method which our Master Himself exemplified, and which He has com-

mitted to His disciples as their primary and peculiar responsibility, the method of faith and of love. The third is this: That in our witness against existing evils, we should concentrate our attention upon those which lie in the field over which we have at least measurable control. The fourth is this: That our witness within the field which we control should be by act as well as by word, by act even more than by word.

Let me illustrate these principles one by one: 1. In dealing with the political issues which face us to-day, our primary concern as a Church is not with effects but with causes.

When one reads the Agenda of such a body as the present Economic Conference, and tries to follow the discussion of the experts whom it has assembled, one is appalled by the number and the complexity of the issues which are raised. Finance, commerce, industry in the technical sense, agriculture, all present problems of extraordinary difficulty, and on each we find opinion divided. Shall we be internationalists and try to work out a world economy, or isolationists, and strive for a self-contained nation? Is stabilization of currency the first step toward economic recovery, or must it wait till, by other means, the price level has been raised? Is economic improvement possible before we have adjusted our outstanding differences and so ensured the world against war, or must politics take precedence. If we decide, as many have decided to-day, that political readjustment must precede economic recovery, how shall we set about it? Is disarmament the way to bring about security, or is security the necessary precondition of disarmament? For months the Disarmament Conference has been debating this question, and it has adjourned with the main issues still undecided.

On all these questions honest men differ. They differ not merely as nationals defending their countries' interests against the nationals of other countries, but as differing groups within each nation. Each nation has its isolationists and its internationalists, its imperialists and its democrats. In such a situation what word can the Church say that is worth saying?

I believe that there is something very definite which it can say. When we look beneath the surface we find that underlying all other causes of difference there is one basic and fundamental cause which lies in the field with which the Church is primarily concerned. This cause has many names, but they all stand for the same thing. It is the determination of each individual or larger group to have its own way at whatever cost to others.

Radicals tell us that the root evil in modern society is the love of money. They find the remedy for the world's evils in a social readjustment which, vesting the ownership of all the means of production in the State, will make private property on any large scale impossible. There are economic arguments for such a change which deserve respectful consideration. But in finance and in human life alike, money is only a token. The desire for money is a symbol of something more fundamental in human nature, more far-reaching in its effects upon human life, namely, that overweening sense of one's own importance that the Chinese call 'face,' and that the Bible calls 'pride.' In the last analysis it is prestige for which men fight, whether on the field of battle with arms, or in the market-place with goods, or in society with what Veblen calls 'conspicuous waste,' and it is this basic cause of our conflicts that we must attack at the roots if permanent peace is to be achieved.

Here the Church finds itself on familiar ground, for it is this fundamental human evil which religion sets out to cure. What religion brings us is a new standard of valuation, the revelation of a God on whom all men alike are dependent, and in whose presence the only appropriate attitude is one of humility. Only as one is brought face to face with God, the Ultimate Good, and has learned to find in Him the satisfaction of his deepest desires, can he find a standard by which to measure his own true worth and rightly determine his true relation to his fellows.

So we are led naturally to the second of our four principles, that in dealing with this fundamental cause of our evils we must follow the method which our Master Himself has given us—the method of faith and of love. This is a truth which cannot be too often reiterated. Wherever we look we find men offering us as a panacea for our social evils some readjustment of the machinery by which our life is organized, and no doubt such readjustment is necessary, and those who are setting their hands to the task are doing an indispensable service. But a change of machinery will carry us but a little way if the spirit of those who use it remains unchanged. It is arguable that socialism may be a better system than our present imperfect capitalism, but a socialist state run by men with the same selfish aims which have all but brought our present capitalism to shipwreck, will lead to a like, and it may prove an even more terrible, disaster. This is not a reason for abandoning our present efforts to find a better method of social organization. It is only to put them in their proper context and to assess them

at their true value. Serious as is our economic and political distress its deepest root is moral, and it is at this point that religion must begin its redemptive work.

This is not simply the conclusion of theologians and of preachers; it represents the sober judgment of economists and men of affairs.

Among recent students of international questions I suppose no one holds a position of greater authority than Sir Arthur Salter, for many years financial adviser to the League of Nations. Many of you will remember the words with which he concludes his latest book, *Recovery*: 'Before the vast magnitude of the tasks ahead, man's spirit has for the moment faltered and has even contracted. The public mood is apprehensive where it should be bold, and defensive where a broad and generous policy is most needed. . . . We are, if we could but grapple with our fate, the most fortunate of the generations of men. In a single lifetime science has given us more power over Nature, and extended further the range of vision of the exploring mind, than in all recorded history. Now, and now only, our material resources, technical knowledge, and industrial skill, are enough to afford to every man of the world's teeming population, physical comfort, adequate leisure, and access to everything in our rich heritage of civilization that he has the personal courage to enjoy. We need only the regulative wisdom to control our activities and the thrusting energy of our sectional and selfish interests. To face the troubles that beset us, this apprehensive and defensive world needs now, above all the qualities it seems for the moment to have abandoned—courage and magnanimity.'

A similar conclusion is reached by Frank Simonds in his book *Can America stay at Home?* Speaking of the question whether America should use its power to bring about a revision of Treaties, he points out that no conceivable revision of Treaties can wholly eliminate the cause of present unrest, namely, the existence in each State of oppressed minorities, and he draws the conclusion that before outward readjustment can bring permanently helpful results, some more basic change must take place. There must be a change in the spirit of the peoples. The will to peace must replace the will for strife.

Here is the place where the Church must begin. It is her function to change the spirits of men, and for this she must use the instrument given her by God—the gospel. The last twenty years have seen many pronouncements by the Church on the social question. I have had my part in drafting not a

few, and I do not regret it. I do not believe that in honestly trying to state what, in her judgment, would be the nature of a just social order, the Church is forsaking her proper sphere, and I believe that all detailed study of specific remedies by Christian men such as is being carried on by the social councils and commissions of the several Churches, and most effectively of all by the Friends, is all to the good, but this represents the second step in our journey, not the first. The first is the creation of the right spirit—the will to peace, and for this, I repeat, we must use the means which God has given us in the gospel of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

Nothing has impressed me more in my study of recent utterances by the Church on the social question, than the disproportionate amount of space they have given to the goal as compared with the way. These statements paint glowing pictures of the ideal social order. They point out in lurid terms the contrast between that order and what we see in the world to-day, but how the transition is to be made from the one picture to the other they do not show, and it is with this transition that we, as Churches, are primarily concerned.

Three things are needed to bring it about: First of all faith—faith in a Power able to change the hearts of men and to make the unruly will the instrument of His purpose; such power as our Calvinistic forefathers found in the gracious Will which before the foundation of the world had chosen His elect for their salvation. Next, repentance for those sins against love of which each of us has been guilty, and a resolute purpose to forsake them in the future, so far as God shall give us light and strength. Finally, brotherly love—a sincere goodwill toward our neighbour that will make it possible for us to enter into his point of view and see things with his eyes, and go as far to meet him as we can without sacrifice of our duty to others.

There is nothing new in this. It is only the old-fashioned gospel that the Church has always been preaching. Why has it had so little effect? Why is a better social order still so far away? Am I wrong in thinking that it is because so often we have been preaching it in the wrong place and to the wrong people? It is so easy to condemn the wicked bankers in Wall Street, or the munition makers in France, or the yellow press, or imperialist Japan, or communism, or fascism, or whatever it is of which we disapprove, so hard to realize that to make our condemnation carry, it should begin at home. I have sometimes thought a convenient definition of the social gospel as we often hear it presented to-day, would be to say that it is a

device for removing the sense of sin from our own shoulders and attaching it to others over whose conduct we have no control.

So I am brought to my third principle, that in her message on the political issues of the day the Church should concentrate her attack upon that part of the evil over which she has at least measurable control. When we analyse the evils against which the Church is called to protest, we find that they are not all, or even chiefly, outside the Church. As an organized body the Church is itself a part of the society which is suffering from the evils it condemns. As a corporation owning and maintaining property it faces all the moral questions which concern property owners. As a business concern employing labour it must deal with all the moral issues which concern employers of labour. As an investor holding large funds in trust, it is involved in all the intimate moral problems with which big business has to do. Indeed, one of the most serious indictments brought by radicals against the Church is that it is itself so indissolubly a part of the present economic system that it is powerless to change it. 'Where the Church is,' once said Professor Harnack to his class, 'there is also a bit of the world.'

Nor is it only through its connexion with economic questions that the Church is involved in the present social system. Politics in the narrower and more technical sense of the word is no stranger to Church courts. Those who know them best, know best what part is played in their deliberations by party in the political sense of that word; how easily the desire for prestige (theoretically banned by the Church's sacred office) reappears as zeal for God's cause and loyalty to His Spirit.

I should be the last to overlook the seriousness of our present denominational divisions, or to minimize the gravity of the issues they raise. The questions which arise between Catholics and Protestants, and within the Free Churches between Presbyterians and Independents, are not unimportant questions. But I venture to believe that as obstacles to reunion they fade into significance as compared with the rivalries that divide different parties within each great branch of the Church, and by their inhibitions make effective common action impossible.

If the message of the Church to the world is to carry home, it is with these internal issues that we must begin. Let us set our own house in order. Let those who are now held apart by internal divisions realize how incomparably more important are the things they hold in common than the lesser issues which divide them, and let them act accordingly. When a divided world is addressed by a

divided Church, the Church's plea for unity will have slight chance of a hearing. Let the Church become one in fact, and there will be hope of union between nations and between classes.

So I am led inevitably to my last point, that if the witness of the Church is to be effective it must be a witness of deed. What can be said that is truer and more timely than the closing words of the Stockholm message—that carefully considered utterance which summed up the final judgment of the first great oecumenical gathering of the Churches held after the Great War. These words have been heard often, but they are as appropriate to-day as in 1925. Let me read them again :

'The Conference has deepened and purified our devotion to the Captain of our salvation. Responding to His call "Follow me," we have in the presence of the Cross accepted the urgent duty of applying His Gospel in all realms of human life—industrial, social, political, and international.

'Thus in the sphere of economics we have declared that the soul is of supreme value, that it must not be subordinated to the rights of property or to the mechanism of industry, and that it may claim as its first right the right of salvation. Therefore we contend for the free and full development of the human personality.

'In the realm of social morality we have considered the problems presented by over-crowding, unemployment, laxity of morals and its evils, crime and the criminal. Here we are led to recognise that these problems are so great that they cannot be solved by individual effort alone, but that the community must accept responsibility for them, and must exercise such social control over individual action as in each instance may be necessary for the common good.

'We have considered the relation of the individual conscience to the State. . . . We summon the Churches to share with us our sense of the horror of war and of its futility as a means of settling international disputes, and to pray and work for the fulfilment of the promise that under the sceptre of the Prince of Peace, "mercy and truth shall meet together, righteousness and peace shall kiss one another." Under the Cross of Jesus Christ we reach out hands to one another.' So far the Stockholm message.

What more can we say to-day than was then said? Yet how little has been done to translate that message into fact. It is here that our responsibility as a Church begins. It is for us to bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and with our penitence to begin at home.

I speak with some feeling on this matter. For the past six months I have been acting as Chairman of the Administrative Committee of the Universal Council on Life and Work, the body which since 1925 has been carrying on the work begun at Stockholm. This Council brings together annually representatives of the non-Roman Churches for conference on practical matters connected with life and work. It maintains a central office in Geneva, and through its research committee conducts conferences, carries on studies, and keeps the different bodies it represents in touch with what is going on at Geneva. It has done useful work as a liaison officer between the Churches and the League of Nations, particularly in connexion with such matters as disarmament and the abolition of the opium traffic. And the importance of the services which it has rendered has been recognized by a recent communication from representatives of the League.

But when one measures what has been done with what might be done, how meagre is our accomplishment. What would it mean if in the momentous issues which face the world to-day there could be heard in Geneva the voice of a united Church?

Why is that voice not heard? It is because the Churches themselves are not united, or where they are united, not on the things that matter most. While we have been discussing our local interests and our denominational affairs, the old enemy against whom our Master has summoned us to fight, the pride and selfishness of the human heart, has been entrenching itself in the councils of the nations, and determining the policies which control our commerce, our industry, and our finance. And when the world in need calls to us for help in its extremity, it finds that we who name the name of Christ cannot bring effective help because we have not yet won the victory over the pride and selfishness in our own hearts.

Last Sunday night it was my privilege to take part in an impressive demonstration. It was a meeting called by the leading churchmen in Birmingham to protest against the unwillingness of the British representatives at Geneva to consent to the total abolition of aerial bombing. A capacity audience packed the Parish Church, and in spite of the rain an overflow meeting was held out of doors. Among the speakers were the Bishop of the diocese; Canon Guy Rogers, the pastor of the Parish Church; Mr. Leyton Richards of the Carrs Lane Church, and Mr. Woods of the Friends. Dr. Wiseman, Moderator-elect of the Wesleyans, gave the meeting the benediction of his presence. The

words spoken were weighty and the whole meeting charged with a sense of serious responsibility. In his impressive address, Mr. Richards recognized that if the Protestants were to make good their case, they must have some practicable alternative to propose, and he declared himself ready to meet the challenge. We are told, he said, that aerial bombing is both the cheapest and most effective way of defending the North-West frontier of India from hostile raids. But he replied that experience had shown that there was another method, at once cheaper and more effective. He reminded his hearers how at an earlier period, when the situation on the frontier was no less tense, and all efforts to deal with it by military force had failed, a Christian doctor, Pennell by name, went alone and unarmed into the camp of the Pathans, and by his helpfulness, courage, and tact, established contacts which brought about the conclusion of an advan-

tageous peace. 'That one man,' said the commanding general, commenting later upon the episode, 'was worth a couple of regiments to the peace of the North-West frontier.' That, Mr. Richards submitted, was the Christian substitute for aerial bombing, and there is no other which will prove permanently effective.

So as we face the pressing questions of our own day let us meet them in the spirit of this Christian doctor, with a faith that expresses itself in deed. We too have resources on which we can draw if we are willing to accept the needed conditions, even the infinite grace of God as made known to us through our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. But we must mean business. Let us have done with little things and give ourselves to the main matter and we shall find that to us too will be given the gifts for the lack of which the world is perishing to-day—courage and magnanimity.

Eduard Meyer on our Lord's Ascension.

BY THE REVEREND C. E. WAGER, HOLWELL RECTORY, HITCHIN.

If Lk 24 were the only account we have of the Ascension, we could not escape the inference that we believed that 'Easter Day' and 'Ascension Day' were one and the same, for there is no hint of a break between vv.⁵⁰⁻⁵² and the preceding narrative of the appearance to the Eleven. The usual explanation given is that in 'Acts' St. Luke expands what was only a brief preliminary notice in his Gospel.

A re-reading, after an interval of some years, of Eduard Meyer's chapters on the Resurrection and the Ascension (in his *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*), combined with the widespread recognition of his importance for N.T. study, is the immediate cause of this article.

At the end of his examination of Lk 24 he says, 'With Luke, on the contrary' (*i.e.* in contrast with the other evangelists), 'all the appearances are placed, purposely, on the one Easter Sunday: directly after the Resurrection, on the same day, 'Jesus completes his work on earth,' and he sums up his analysis of Luke's Resurrection-narrative by claiming that 'it has given us at once a lively insight into its literary character. Everywhere we see a conscious disposal (*ein bewusstes Schalten*), a careful deliberation extending even to details, both where

he follows his source literally or merely with modifications of style, and where he departs from it whether by omissions, additions, or, as frequently happens, simple alterations. Throughout he is guided by the effort to combine in one inner unity the various narratives, to bring clearly into relief those instances which for him seem determinative, to set forth the story of Redemption in its historical development. He knows what he means to do, and where he thinks it necessary he does not shrink from vigorous interference with sources, or from a thoroughgoing alteration and correction of them, just because he has given accurate consideration to the matters and has carefully weighed what he will say and what he will not. By this conscious procedure he is completely differentiated from Mark as from Matthew, though equally removed from that radical transformation of the tradition, on the basis of a pre-arranged programme, which the Johannine Gospel has carried out. It is throughout, as we must admit from the literary character of his work, the thoughtful historian with whom we have to do, and only now is it plain that if we take the standpoint of the believing Christian, he is well qualified for his task.'

What is of special interest here is the combination

of criticism unfettered by dogmatic ties, together with a high regard for Luke's literary and historical capacity. It is just because of his high evaluation of Luke the historian that Meyer is confident that in the first chapter of Acts there is so much that cannot be Luke's, because it is impossible to fit it in with the admirable scheme underlying his Gospel. So the whole narrative of the Ascension in Ac 1, he says, is an interpolation, which reaches its climax in 3^b, 'appearing unto them by the space of forty days.' This, he says, turns the whole structure of the picture in the first book upside down (*Wirft den gesamten Aufbau der Darstellung der ersten Buchs über den Haufen*), and stands in the sharpest contradiction to it.

Obviously if Meyer is right, then among the commonly accepted beliefs of the Christian Church in the past which have given way under the pressure of weighty and thoughtful criticism we must now place that of 'the great Forty Days,' and perhaps incidentally try to discover an adequate cause for the belief. And Meyer is not easily dismissed as a mere extremist. To quote the late Bishop Gore (of revered memory): 'A few years ago the man whom we may call the greatest living authority on the history of antiquity as a whole, Eduard Meyer, found it necessary to give careful investigation to the *Origin and Beginnings of Christianity*. He is a thoroughgoing "rationalist," and would deal with the Christian documents without any reverential prejudice. But when, after studying for a number of years the contemporary criticism of the New Testament in Germany, he produced his history, it was found to be remarkably conservative in its estimate of the documents, and full of hostile notes upon the critics, as men who have allowed their estimate of what the facts must have been to distort their judgment of the documents, and, again, as men who have constantly mistaken unproved hypothesis for facts' (*Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 190). But of Meyer's treatment of the account of the Ascension in Ac 1 he merely says in a footnote: 'There seems to me to be no adequate ground for the assumption of Meyer that the narrative of the Ascension' (I suppose he means the account in Acts, not that in the Gospel) 'is an interpolation' (*Reconstruction of Belief*, p. 369 n.). The psychologist would naturally see in this acceptance of Meyer where he is 'conservative,' together with his rejection where he is not, the hidden work of 'unconscious motivation.' If may be of value, therefore, to re-examine Meyer's reasons for his confident assertions about the 'interpolation.'

Our knowledge of the *koine* Greek of the N.T.

has taught us much in this century. Thus τὸν πρῶτον λόγον does not demand a projected *third* volume, but is merely a variant for τὸν πρότερον. But λόγον is important as being commonly used as the equivalent of our 'volume.' Thus Luke in beginning his 'volume ii.' naturally refers back to his 'volume i.' for he considers them as together making one continuous work, and, like any other careful Greek historian, he would certainly begin volume ii. with a reference to volume i. and a statement of the plan of volume ii. Thus we get the correct beginning τὸν μὲν . . . and v.¹ is excellent and sensible Greek, but we look in vain for the balancing δέ, or for any reference to the scheme of volume ii. (*ἤρξατο* must not, of course, be pressed too much; it is a recognized Semitism). Instead we get in v.² a bit of difficult and really untranslatable Greek, followed by an account of the Ascension in much greater detail than that at the end of the Gospel and in no sense a completion or further expansion of that; on the contrary, it is *stärkstem Widerspruch* to it, and the expected reference to v.¹ never comes.

'This fact,' says Meyer, 'is quite notorious and unambiguous. All attempts to explain it away by means of ingenious interpretation, and to save at least a nucleus of v.³ for Luke is hopeless from the start. A writer who intended to narrate, in correspondence with the recapitulation of the previous volume, what is here imparted, would be obliged to speak quite differently. There can be no shaking from the fact' (*an der Tatsache . . . ist nicht zu rütteln*) 'that here is a great interpolation that on to Luke's own words has been patched a statement quite foreign to him, for which the original expansion of the introductory words has been sacrificed. No man has ever formulated his thought, whether in speech or in writing, in the way in which the text now runs.'

V.², he says, shows at once the presence of flaws in the text. Thus *ἐντελόμενος* lacks an object: διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, in spite of various attempts (as some MSS and versions show) hangs completely in the air, and even if they could be taken with either ἐξελέατο or ἐντελόμενος, the Gospel agrees with neither statement. Plainly the only words we can here accept as Luke's are ἀρχῆς ἡμέρας ἀνελύμφθη. What else originally came there, e.g. ἐντελόμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, οὓς ἐξελέατο κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, is, of course, only conjecture.

The interpolation uses expressions from the end of volume i., but goes further: e.g. ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις would emphasize *more* appearance

than Luke mentions. So v.⁵ belongs to the older tradition of Mk 8, but there it is not our Lord's statement, but the Baptist's.

More important than these 'harmless additions,' however, is the second part of v.³, 'being seen of them forty days speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.' If Luke were *correcting* here his statement at the end of volume i. he 'must have expressed himself quite otherwise.'

Where, then, does this addition come from? Meyer is at once ready with the hypothesis—it has been taken over from the Gnostics, who had to find room for *their* secret traditions in such a period of continued intercourse of the risen Lord with the disciples—a period varying, in different Gnostic systems, from eighteen months to twelve years. 'That Ac 1³ already contains this outlook of further revelations of τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ plainly shows that here we have to do with a stage which goes far beyond Luke and the time of the Apostles.' Moreover, in form as well as content, he says, this interpolation shows its secondary origin, for 'when they therefore were come together' in v.⁶ does not agree with 'being assembled together with them' in v.⁴: Jesus had been speaking to them about the kingdom all through the forty days, yet (v.⁶) they now ask Him about it. The promise of the Spirit in v.⁵ is repeated in v.⁸. There is no definite day given for the Ascension, but from the context, which, however, has no connexion with v.^{6ff.}, it has been concluded that it took place on the fortieth day, although in itself it could have happened just as well on Easter Day or on any other chosen day. 'Thus it is quite evident that v.^{3ff.} and v.^{6ff.} are doublets which both aim at filling out and completing the brief account at the end of the Gospel. The account of the Ascension in v.^{6ff.}, as being the more naïve, is also the earlier section; v.^{3ff.} introduces the long sojourn with the disciples and the revelation of secrets, and reaches considerably beyond the time of the Apostles.'

In v.⁶ we are told 'they came together,' but when and where we are not told, only in v.¹² did we learn that the scene was the Mount of Olives (and a quite unnecessary note here is added about its distance from Jerusalem). In the reply to their question the positive statement further expands the promise in Lk 24^{47f.}, through the mention of the Holy Spirit and of the three groups in which the gospel is to be 'witnessed'; the negative (v.⁷) turns aside the old question about the fixed time of the founding of the Messianic kingdom in the same manner as the saying in Mk 13³² (= Mt 24³⁶) which Lk 21^{32f.} omits, obviously because it does not harmonize with his ideas

of our Lord. By means of the combination of both statements the Church which the preaching has produced appears as an *Interimisticum* of undefined duration between the announcement and the establishment of the 'kingdom of Israel' in a manner parallel to the authority of the Law in Judaism. Then follows the Ascension. The 'two men in white apparel' are those of the Resurrection (Lk 24⁴), and their statement corresponds to that of Lk 21²⁷ (= Mk 13²⁶). This result of text-analysis is strikingly confirmed, so Meyer claims, by the speech of Peter in Ac 10, in which a short sketch of our Lord's life is given with constant references to the Gospel (e.g. cf. 10⁴³ with Lk 24⁴⁷). 'This speech shows that Luke in the Acts has exactly the same conception as in the Gospel, and that, therefore, the rearrangement of the narrative there given through the interpolation of Ac 1^{3ff.} is completely foreign to him.' Just where the interpolation ends we cannot say for certain. By v.¹⁵ anyhow, but vv.^{13, 14} may be doubtful. He thinks it most probable that they contain Lucan material (e.g. the repetition of the list of Apostles in Lk 6¹⁴ would be quite likely), but in *starker Uebersarbeitung*.

We certainly see in all this nothing of Meyer's 'hostility to the critics.' On purely critical grounds his theory has much to recommend it. But 'purely critical grounds' represents an extraordinarily high degree of unbiassed objectivity which few, if any, critics, conservative or otherwise, attain. Non-rational motives lie more or less deeply hidden, so that the purely scientific attitude in matters that touch us so closely as religious beliefs would seem to demand as a preliminary in every critic a searching and prolonged psychological analysis. The present writer is strongly convinced that the criticism of religion in its different departments is in great need, not merely of a 'psychological approach' to religion as a branch of human experience, but of a psychological approach to criticism itself. This is not the place for a long digression, but those who are persuaded that Meyer is right about the 'great Forty Days,' will doubtless (like the present writer) be quite ready to acknowledge that they would *like* him to be right; they would equally ask those who think Meyer's conclusions quite unsound to recognize in themselves a probable desire that he should be wrong!

Biblical criticism has an interesting history. At first confined to the Old Testament, by using much the same *kind* of examination of the text as Meyer gives here to Ac 1, it built up—to take one example—a gradually developing hypothesis of different documents in the Pentateuch. Stoutly resisted at

first, this theory has won its way to general acceptance among responsible students, and it is recognized as a valuable help to the understanding of the growth of religious ideas in Old Testament times. If a miraculous voice from heaven somehow compelled us to accept on 'authority' a pre-critical view of the O.T., the facts would then seem so hopelessly complicated that we should probably abandon any attempt at a reasonable religion—a procedure not altogether unknown in our own day. Still, so long as criticism was confined to its earlier sphere, its destructiveness was seen to be more positive than negative in its results. When, however, it reached New Testament writings, current orthodoxy was much more apprehensive; it perceived a dangerous revolution in process. This revolution is still in its early stages. Its full implications are in many quarters strongly resisted or very reluctantly accepted. The reason is plain—Old Testament criticism (it might be held) did not greatly affect traditionally orthodox Christianity; the New Testament 'revolution,' where it is really accepted, *does*.

It is no doubt true that Meyer does here and there give a sharp rap to the knuckles of a critic or two for minor extravagances, but as a critical historian who possesses a large degree of the historian's balanced judgment he is quite unconcerned with the possible effect of his conclusions upon any 'doxy' at all. We must, therefore, try to form our opinion both of his conclusions, and of his methods of arriving at them, with the same objectivity, if we can.

(i) The ordinary reader of St. Luke's Gospel will easily miss the significance of the fact that it is volume i. of a two-volume work. It means that we may expect the author to use the same methods of compilation in both volumes. Thus he uses existing documents in both, consisting of earlier drafts of his own work ('Proto Luke'? and the 'We' document), as well as documents like 'Q' and the (probably) Aramaic original of the earlier part of Acts. We realize, too, as Meyer points out, how freely Luke is prepared to alter his documents, now and then to suit his didactic purposes. On that showing, between the writing of volume i. and volume ii. he may quite well have come across a narrative of the Ascension which gave a different account from the brief notice in volume i., but he is much too careful a writer and too good a stylist, to leave such a discrepancy between the last chapter of volume i. and the first chapter of volume ii. The cogency of Meyer's further arguments is affected by the acceptance or not of this first argu-

ment, though they have considerable value separately. Thus (ii) the impossible Greek in v.² might be explained by early corruption of the text, but this conception would itself be better explained by the hypothesis that the insertion of the Ascension narrative has affected v.² (the piece of new cloth 'taking away' something from the old, at the joint).

(iii) Meyer thinks the interpolation is itself composite, arguing that 'doublets' are apparent. That does not necessarily exclude Lucan authorship—he is quite capable of doublets sometimes in volume i when he uses both 'Q' and Mark, but he never puts the two parts of the doublet into the same context, as is done in this passage in Ac 1 (for details see p. 493 above).

(iv) If Luke wrote v.⁵ he *may* have made the slip of attributing to our Lord the words, 'he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost,' by a half-memory of what he had written in Lk 3¹⁸. If so, would he not also have remembered the καὶ πνεύματι, which he (and Matthew) add to the saying in Mk 1⁸? It would surely be difficult for him to *omit* this, with the narrative of Pentecost in his mind. But if the interpolator is here depending on Mark, that would explain the omission.

(v) V.⁷ implies that only the Father knows the time when the kingdom will be inaugurated. This is the same outlook as Mk 13³² ('But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father'). Luke in ch. 21 follows this 'Little Apocalypse' of Mark fairly closely until this verse. Now, by the customary canons of Synoptic criticism, we should say that Luke purposely omits that verse, because it might seem to imply a limitation of our Lord's knowledge which was foreign to Luke's own conception of Him. Meyer says it is, therefore, impossible that Ac 1⁷ is Luke's, and, to the present writer, that argument is weighty.

(vi) Then there is the question of v.³, and the motive for such a statement. 'Gnosticism' may, no doubt, be a convenient wastepaper basket into which we cheerfully pitch those fragments of early Christian literature for which we have no better use, but we remember that the Gnostics, from the date of the Leucian 'Acts' onwards, made great use of varied literary forms to support their views, and these views *needed* just the kind of support whose germ might well be seen in this verse 'being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things concerning the kingdom of God.' Meyer does not say that this is a Gnostic insertion, but that it has been taken over from them. Of course there is no proof

of this, but if on more general grounds we accept his contention about the whole passage, then this is a satisfactory explanation of this verse.

Finally, though one might think this point not the strongest part of the whole argument, it is certainly the fact that in Ac 10 the brief statement of the facts of our Lord's life on earth passes at once from the Resurrection to His being 'ordained to be the Judge of quick and dead.' If Ac 1¹⁰¹.

are Luke's we might fairly expect a similar link between Ac 10^{40, 42}. Though this detail is not convincing by itself, it both supports and is supported by the cumulative effect of the whole.

Perhaps the *least*, therefore, that really unbiased criticism would allow would be the statement that Meyer's rejection of the Ascension-narrative in Ac 1 cannot be summarily dismissed, whether by footnote or otherwise, but deserves serious consideration.

Literature.

NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY.

The Christ of the Christian Faith (Macmillan; \$2.00), by Dr. W. Douglas Mackenzie, is a noteworthy contribution to the study of Christology. The late Dr. James Hastings regarded President Mackenzie's article 'Jesus Christ' in the seventh volume of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* as a model article, and we have often thought that it might well be printed in book form. In this volume the first half of the article is reproduced, with a number of technical discussions omitted. But the volume contains also a great deal of new material.

After a chapter of General Introduction, Dr. Mackenzie turns to the subject of the Consciousness of Jesus, discussing successively the origin and nature of the problem, the personal religion of Jesus, the relation of His mission thereto, and the method of His mission. Then follow chapters on the relation of Christ to the Christian Church and to the moral regeneration of mankind, and on the Consciousness of Jesus as viewed in the Pauline and Johannine Christologies.

The whole discussion, which is solid and thoughtful, is based upon a careful study of the recent voluminous literature on the subject, and not the least valuable part of it is the references for further study. The standpoint is conservative, but Dr. Mackenzie's conservatism is not of the hidebound order, being sensitive to the various currents of modern thought and criticism. It is a book which might well be prescribed in our theological schools; yet it is so written that it may be understood of the 'plain man.'

Dr. Mackenzie concludes by expressing the opinion that if we would understand the fact of

Incarnation, we must approach it not only with at least a respectful attitude toward the ancient discussions from Nicæa to Chalcedon, but with minds aware of the light upon it which may come from biology and psychology and a true philosophy of evolution. But we must admit at the start that Jesus has proved Himself for two thousand years to be the Saviour and Lord of mankind.

THE MEANING OF RELIGION.

The Meaning and Truth of Religion (Scribner's; 12s. 6d. net) is a large book of four hundred and seventy pages, in which Professor Eugene W. Lyman makes his way with a sure step and a certain unruffled imperturbability through the maze of problems and interpretations, of discussions and attacks, by which religion finds itself confronted in our time, all with a view to showing that religion is a creative energizing force in life and in the world.

Here is a man who has read widely, who quotes aptly, though, as is the way with most Americans, with a catholicity which, on occasion, is satisfied with witnesses not over weighty, who has listened long and closely to the murmuring of the shell of this unquiet age, and gives a deft summary of it all, and of how his mind is affected by the clashing of opinion round him.

It is sound and pertinent and interesting, is laid out on a wide and comprehensive plan with far horizons—is, in short, a worthy contribution to the philosophy of religion, which should be helpful to many. Denney declared it was a pity that the creeds had come down from philosophical times, seeing that the world to-day is interested not in philosophy but in science. And,

certainly, it seems as if the trenches, cut to meet the attacks of their own day, need to be re-formed to meet the new assaults pressed home from a new angle. Such a book as this, dealing with the pressing questions of the hour, should be of use. Relativity, the Quantum Theory, and the like, and how they impinge on our religious thinking, or matters like the Crisis Theology, are here competently handled. None the less, religion means, and truly is, much more than this correct and intellectual presentation of it. There are depths in it, a passion and a power, which are not brought to light by this dissector's clever fingers. This is a real contribution to present-day apologetics. But the title suggests a book 'further ben.'

MORAL PROBLEMS.

A volume of a very practical and useful nature is *Conduct*, by the Rev. T. W. Pym, Chaplain and Fellow of Balliol (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Pym is known widely for his books on psychology and Christianity, and here he applies his psychology to the problems of personal duty. His main purpose is to outline a method whereby the individual may decide questions of right and wrong in his personal life. Social ethics is excluded. The question dealt with is: How am I, personally, to know what goodness is in this case or that? We have a good analysis of the sources of that moral perplexity in which people often find themselves. There is, for example, sometimes no guidance to be found in the Bible on our modern problems, and in the absence of this we are pressed on all sides by the discouraging moral atmosphere of our time.

The author quite frankly assumes a belief in God as revealed in Christ, and in Christ as the standard of goodness. And he admits that there are no rules for Christian conduct. We have to decide for ourselves on the basis of the principles Christ laid down, aided (as his closing chapter emphasizes) by the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But the perplexity even so remains very real on certain points. What about small bets on a game of bridge? They undoubtedly curb the folly of selfish players. Are they wrong? And why?

This is the particular question dealt with in a symposium published under the title: *Is It Wrong to Gamble?* (S.C.M.; 1s. net). The writers are R. Cove-Smith, the famous Rugby internationalist, Jack Hobbs, the even more famous

cricketer, Frank Lenwood, and others, and there is an excellent introduction by Lord Astor which should frighten off 'mugs' from the silly game of betting on horses if they are susceptible to reason or fact. The book is, however, not over helpful, since it repeats the clichés which are so familiar and so unconvincing. Gambling may be 'economical waste,' and 'an expression of the acquisitive spirit,' and seeking money without giving value in work, but then so are many other things practised even by good people. It is very difficult to construct an argument that condemns gambling without condemning much else. The real argument against it is, as Canon Peter Green has shown in his excellent book, its effects on life and character. That is the one final and conclusive condemnation.

COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

One of the really live issues of to-day is the challenge of Communism both to our social order and to our religious faith. In view of this the Student Christian Movement Press is publishing a number of volumes, written from different points of view, to help Christian people to assess both the truth and the error of the Communist doctrine and way of life. Two of these volumes have just appeared, *The Truth and Error of Communism*, by Mr. H. G. Wood, M.A., Lecturer at Selly Oak College (4s. net), and *Communism and the Alternative*, by Mr. Arthur J. Pentty (3s. 6d. net). The former book is longer, fuller, more analytic and, in its exposition and criticism, more thorough. But the latter is fresh, original, well-informed, and by no means superfluous. Both books insist on the fact that Communism is a religion, an alternative religion to Christianity. But this is an abuse of words. Communism is the negation of all that religion (any religion) means or claims. It is atheistic, materialistic, unmoral, mechanistic. It is perfectly true that Communism is inspired by a passionate hope and by a compelling cause, but that only means that men can be moved, and moved deeply, by materialistic aims and by class loyalty. Let us drop this representation of Bolshevism as a religion, and say plainly that the great alternative is between a spiritual view of life and a materialistic view.

The main characteristics of this social creed are these. First, it is a negation of God. Secondly, it is a way of violent revolution. It does not believe in moral appeal. Mr. Middleton Murry justifies its violence on the ground that group

morality is essentially non-moral. Violence may sometimes be justified, but violence is the declared policy of Bolshevism. Thirdly, Communism is immoral. In his book on Education and Society Mr. Bertrand Russell says that the only morality taught in Soviet Schools is what is useful to the proletariat, and when the Soviet is fully established there will be no morality taught at all.

These are general features of the system. Mr. Wood analyses the economic basis of it at considerable length. His exposition is admirably lucid and his criticisms searching and convincing. It would be difficult to find a better popular account of Marx's 'Capital' than we get here, and those who have toiled through that singular work will be grateful for both explanation and answer. Mr. Penty goes on different lines, but both writers insist that Communism can only be met, and its challenge countered, by a social ideal and gospel truer and worthier and more moral. Christianity is the only real answer, because Christianity takes a spiritual view of man, but it must be a Christianity that is fearlessly applied to our social ideals and practices. We need a drastic socializing of our industrial system which will make the world fit for the plain man to live in. Mr. Wood and Mr. Penty have different views of what this implies. But at any rate it may be hoped that books such as these will be read and seriously considered by the youth who will have the deciding influence in shaping the new era.

THEISTIC APOLOGY.

The Plain Man seeks for God (Scribner's; 2s. 6d. net) is a contribution to theistic philosophy, couched in an attractive popular style, from Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, Associate Professor of Systematic Theology and the Philosophy of Religion in Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Dr. Van Dusen suggests that much of our modern doubt and confusion is due to the fact that many lack the conviction of the activity of God, of His vital contact with our lives. And he urges that unless we can regain a reasoned conviction of God's activity, God as a power in human life will disappear.

He himself essays to build up an inductive argument for the reality of God upon the foundation of modern science. He suggests that we meet with God in the primordial structure of the world, of which He is the Author and Sustainer; in the upward nisus of the world, which is His purpose; and in the experiences of value which stand as

the culmination of Nature's striving and adumbrate God's hope for the world.

Turning from the realm of Nature to the experience of human values, Dr. Van Dusen seeks to broaden the foundations of his argument. For facts and values are not dissociated, but belong to the one cosmic order. Through a philosophy of values he reaches a richer and fuller conception of God than the philosophy of Nature had yielded.

And now the discussion turns upon itself. The limitations of the inductive approach to the reality of God are recognized. It is seen that the proper function of the mind in knowledge is not creation but reception. Certainty of God has been not so much a conclusion of a train of reasoning as an awakening to the deeper significance of familiar experience. We would not seek Him if we had not already possessed Him.

Readers of theistic literature will have noticed that Dr. Van Dusen's line of exposition is not unfamiliar, but there are vitality and freshness in his writing that make his book worth attention.

His final chapter takes up the well-worn theme of the problem of evil. In the end, as he says, we are forced to a choice between two alternative positions. Either the Ultimate Reality is indifferent to man's welfare and the triumph of man's highest values, or the Ultimate Reality is solicitous for man and his ideals. On the first alternative the issue is a philosophy of noble resignation, on the second a reasoned religious faith. Which brings Dr. Van Dusen to the concluding note of an interesting book—the necessity of faith in the fullest religious life.

Any one who is perplexed about the existing international scandal of abounding plenty in a world where low wages and widespread unemployment prevail, cannot do better than read the Swarthmore Lecture for 1933 on *Unemployment and Plenty* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d.; paper covers, 1s. 6d. net), by Mr. Shipley N. Brayshaw, M.I.Mech.E. This little book contains a most valuable collection of facts and opinions bearing on the present perplexing economic situation, and it justly deserves to receive a wide circulation. 'In days of old,' Mr. Brayshaw writes, 'a land flowing with milk and honey seemed a desirable place to live in . . . but we have arrived at a point at which there is something incongruous in holding a harvest thanksgiving. We find that when the earth yields her increase there is too

much of everything so we must all economise.' The author refuses to despair, however, because he believes that anything like the united will, determination, and self-sacrifice of the War-period 'would suffice to transform unemployment into a nightmare of the past.' Believing that drastic changes are necessary in our social and economic system, Mr. Brayshaw is also convinced that something like a religious revival is needed. He finds the basis for this—inadequately, as it seems to us—in 'our belief in the unity and divinity of man.' In spite of this criticism, we desire to commend this book for its remarkable combination of wide knowledge with wise and balanced suggestions, and for the atmosphere of glowing religious conviction which pervades the whole.

By the publication of *David Kimhi's Hebrew Grammar* (Dropsie College, Philadelphia; \$2.00), Dr. William Chomsky has made it possible for modern students of Hebrew grammar to realize the extent of their debt to grammarians of the past, of whom Kimhi was one of the most famous. This book is not an exact reproduction in English of Kimhi, it is something better; Dr. Chomsky has rearranged the material and brought it into line with modern grammatical works, besides reducing its compass by avoiding repetitions. Dr. Chomsky has greatly enhanced the value of his work by appending elaborate notes, which enable one in a measure to trace the history of Hebrew grammar from mediæval times down to the present day, and to feel how far from being yet settled are some of its problems; for example, the pronunciation of 'sh'wa mobile.' We are reminded of the influence of Latin on the organization of the vowel system, and of the terminology of the Indo-Germanic tenses upon the verb; and we learn that, as a paradigm, קָטַל had as predecessors שָׁמַר and פָּקַד. There are interesting discussions of 'methegh,' of ׁ as a relative particle, and dozens of other points. This edition of Kimhi together with the notes cannot fail to interest all genuine students of the Hebrew language.

Walter Bagehot said that Shakespeare had an 'experiencing nature,' and that this was one secret of his greatness. It is such an attitude to life that is commended in *On Being Alive*, by Dr. Walter Russell Bowie (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). 'This book,' says the jacket, 'shows how, when, and why life can be interesting and full of meaning'; and if exhortation and example could make us fully alive this book would have a creative value. Perhaps that is too much to expect of any book. In any

case Dr. Bowie's chapters are full of high spirits and of something more. They are rich in imagination and suggestion. The author has read widely and can use his reading to illuminate his points. What the late Dr. Stalker once said of Martensen's 'Christian Ethics' is true of Dr. Bowie's volume—it is crawling with sermons. And many more than preachers may turn with pleasure and profit to these vivid essays as being alive to Nature, people, truth, poetry, and God.

Asking God, by the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net), contains three addresses on the petitionary aspect of prayer. Reviewing our Lord's teachings on prayer, the writer points out that 'they lay overwhelming stress on the petitionary side of prayer. They exhort us to definite and persistent asking. They assure us that if we fulfil the conditions the whole power of God is at our service.' The three lectures deal with petitionary prayer, first in relation to God the Father to whom we pray; second, to God the Son in whose name we pray; and third, to God the Holy Spirit by whose quickening and illumination and prompting we pray. These lectures should prove spiritually helpful, for they are based on sound Christian teaching, and are rich in fine devotional feeling.

The Jewish Publication Society of America in Philadelphia has published three *Lectures on Jewish Liturgy* entitled respectively (i) Rabban Gamaliel II. Reorganizer of the Synagogal Services, (ii) The Prayer Book of Maimonides, and (iii) Cabbalistic Interpolations in the Prayer Book. The first illustrates the problems created by the substitution of prayers for the sacrificial services and the modifications made upon the famous Shemoneh Esrei (Eighteen Benedictions). The second discusses the similarities between the Prayer Book of Maimonides and that of Saadia two and a half centuries earlier, and shows how the former attacked the liturgical problem with dignity, reverence, and courage. The third reveals the influence of mysticism upon expounders of Jewish Law. The book will have a special interest for Jewish scholars.

To the Lutterworth Papers already published by the Lutterworth Press (a series of brief pamphlets on big themes) have been added five more: *Can I be sure of God?*, by the Rev. Conrad Skinner, M.A. (3d.); *Religion and the Younger Generation*, by M. Basil A. Fletcher, B.Sc. (a headmaster) (3d.). *The Indispensable Laity*, by the Rev. Archibald

Chisholm, D.Litt. (3d.); *Is there a Christian Revolution?*, by Mr. J. W. Stevenson, M.A. (4d.); and *Christian Certainty and the Modern Mind*, by the Rev. A. W. McClymont, M.A., D.Litt. (4d.). They are all good within their limits and all interesting.

Evangelical Influence in English Life (Macmillan; 5s. net), by James Theodore Inskip, D.D., Bishop of Barking, is composed of the Golden Lectures delivered in the Church of St. Margaret, Lothbury, 1932-33. The volume may be regarded as complementary to the works that have been published this year to mark the centenary of the Oxford Movement. For Dr. Inskip sets forth Evangelical principles, and regards the Evangelicals as the best interpreters and representatives of the Church of England as a Reformed Church.

But his aim in these lectures is to discuss the working of a particular spirit and of particular principles rather than the fortunes of a particular party in the Church of England. That spirit and those principles he endeavours to trace from the beginnings of Christianity, emphasizing the centrality of the Cross of Christ in Christian history.

The scope of the book is well indicated in the titles of its chapters. Besides general chapters on such subjects as the Evangelical Message, Church and Ministry, the Sacraments, the Reformation, the Evangelical Revival, it contains some chapters on particular subjects, such as those on John Wycliffe, the Abolition of Slavery, England's Debt to Lord Shaftesbury, and Missionary Work Overseas. The three chapters last-named are a reminder of three achievements which, as the Archbishop of York remarked recently, must be set to the credit of the Evangelical Revival, the second of the three being, of course, factory legislation.

It is a very readable volume, and by no means partisan, though Dr. Inskip does not conceal his Evangelical sympathies.

When we read in *Notes on the Book of Daniel*, by Lucy E. Long (Marshall Press; 1s. 6d. net), that 'the full beauty of these prophecies can only be seen from the British-Israel point of view,' when we meet the statements that 'there is no doubt that Ezekiel and Daniel had intercourse,' and that 'the ten horns mean the ten kingdoms which grew out of the wreck of the Roman Empire in 476 A.D.,' and when we note that one chapter is entitled 'The Revelation of the Second Advent,' our expectations are not pitched very high. There is much piety and some history in these Notes, but Notes written 'from the British-Israel point of view' can hardly

be regarded as a serious contribution to the exposition of the book.

We wonder what percentage of our readers could answer the question, Who was Edward Hincks? Some scholars there be which have no memorial, who are perished as though they had never been, and Hincks is an instance. His life covered the period 1792-1866. He was never in any more exalted post than that of a country clergyman. Yet he had a European reputation among Orientalists. He was a pioneer in the deciphering of Egyptian monuments. Independently of Rawlinson he found the secret of cuneiform inscriptions, and laid a sure foundation for Assyrian grammar. He wrote numerous papers for learned Societies. Why, then, has he been so largely forgotten? Just because he published nothing for a wider public than the small body of experts. His epoch-making work was buried in the Transactions of those very learned Societies where the general public could not look for it, but where unscrupulous rivals could discover it and trick it out as their own. Tardy justice, so far as is possible, has at last been done to a very distinguished scholar by his grandson, Mr. E. F. Davidson, M.A., in *Edward Hincks: A Selection from his Correspondence, with a Memoir* (Milford; 2os. net).

Mr. Arthur Kenyon Rogers has given us a most readable and very able discussion in *The Socratic Problem* (Milford; 12s. net). The problem is threefold—to set the Platonic Dialogues in their chronological order, to distinguish in the Dialogues the real from the 'literary-device' Socrates, and to estimate how far Xenophon's account gives real information. Mr. Rogers takes us with him almost all the way. According to him, Xenophon's Socrates is little more likely to be drawn from life than Cyprus of the Cyropædia. Whether one agrees with that view or not, this competent work will amply repay study.

Mr. J. N. Findlay, Lecturer in Philosophy in the University of Pretoria, has performed a meritorious piece of scholarly work in writing *Meinong's Theory of Objects* (Milford; 15s. net). In the first place the Austrian philosopher's work is for the first time made adequately known in English, and in the second place the development of Meinong's own thought is carefully shown, and in the third place some very penetrating criticism of Meinong's views is here submitted. Frankly this volume is not one for summer reading, nor

will a wide public be able to appreciate it. But alike in psychology and in epistemology Meinong had something important to say on the relation of thought to reality, and Mr. Findlay has made it as understandable as the abstruse subject admits.

In *Makers of Astronomy* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Hector Macpherson, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.R.A.S., we have an excellent popular introduction to the life-work of the chief modern astronomers, as well as a book of reference containing information not readily accessible to the general reader. Some contemporary scientists, such as Einstein and James, have been omitted owing to reasons of space, but all living astronomers, together with those of past ages whose work has led to any striking advance in astronomy, have been included. The book is a story of the growing insignificance of the earth and indeed of the solar system. We behold a solar system shrunk to nothingness—a mere grain-dust amid the glory of the universe. Man himself seems to live on a dwarf planet moving round a dwarf star which is only one of millions in a galaxy of millions, yet, as the author points out, he has infinite dignity, for he has weighed the stars in scales and the galaxies in a balance. No one could have described the lives and work of the makers of astronomy better than Dr. Macpherson, and we congratulate him on the production of such an interesting and useful volume. Here is splendid material for

preachers and lecturers of an astronomical turn of mind.

It was a happy thought that led the Young Men's Committee of the Church of Scotland to ask the Rev. J. S. Stewart, B.D., to write a text-book for Bible Classes on *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*. The Student Christian Movement, conscious of its value, 'has sought and obtained permission to publish the book outside Scotland because it fills a gap in existing literature and is likely to prove of considerable value to a much wider constituency than the one for which it was originally planned.' It is now issued (S.C.M., 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Stewart is endowed in an eminent degree with three notable qualifications for his work. He is at once scholar, teacher, and preacher. He does not obtrude critical questions but writes with a full knowledge of them, from what might be considered a somewhat conservative standpoint. His supreme interest is in the gospel message of which he is a born teacher and preacher. He writes clearly and marshals his points with great precision, as befits a text-book. At the same time there breathes through his exposition an ardent devotion to Jesus Christ. His book is above all else a challenge, 'What think ye of Christ?' and its whole aim and the weight of its argument are to inspire youthful hearts with 'the passion to make Jesus King.'

A single criticism—the cover is unusually flimsy and quite unworthy of a book of this size and value.

The Message of the Epistles.

I Corinthians.

By PROFESSOR T. W. MANSON, M.A., D.LITT., MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

WHEN Luther in his tract on Christian Liberty laid down the two fundamental propositions: 'A Christian man is the most free lord of all, and subject to none; a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, and subject to every one,' he was in effect summarizing in two sentences the two Pauline Epistles—Galatians and I Corinthians. And it is significant that almost immediately he quotes as the first 'proof-text' for his second proposition the words of Paul in 1 Co 9¹⁹: 'Though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself

servant unto all.' It would be going too far to say that freedom is the sole theme of Gal., or service of 1 Co. For even in Gal. Paul is careful to bring in service in love as the complementary principle to that of freedom. 'Brethren, you have been called for freedom; only do not take freedom as an occasion to the flesh, but through love serve one another' (Gal 5¹³). Yet it is not too much to say that, while in Gal. the chief emphasis is on the freedom of Christians, in 1 Co. it is on the serving of one another through love.

Now it is possible—indeed it is frequently done—to write page after page in a more or less elevated style in praise of love and service. There is a real danger in every age, not least in our own, that vague and sentimental rhetoric about these great principles should take the place of honest attempts to apply them to the circumstances and problems of our own time and our own lives. It is the more significant that the 13th ch. of 1 Co is not the whole of the Epistle, though it is probably the key to it. The greatest part of this letter is taken up with the application of Paul's high principles to the very commonplace practical difficulties of living a Christian life in Corinth in the middle of the first century A.D. The moral is obvious.

But 1 Co. is not only the most 'practical' of all the Pauline letters. There is a sense in which it is the most 'church-conscious.' The reason is not far to seek. Love and service are terms which have real meaning only within a fellowship of some sort: and love and service of the kind that Paul has in mind have their full meaning and realization only within the fellowship of the Spirit, in the Church which is Christ's body. This fact has its bearing on Paul's conception of the Church. For love and service are things that pass only between persons. The Church, if we define it as the context within which the terms love and service have meaning, cannot be a system of doctrine or polity: it must be people, who in virtue of a common link with Christ are united to one another in the way of caring for and helping one another without limit. So sacred is this union of Christians that to break it is equivalent to sacrilege (3^{16f.}). So close is it that the most apt figure to represent it is that of the several organs and limbs in a living body (12¹²⁻³¹). The great theme of the Epistle is thus that the foundation principle of the Christian life is love (ch. 13). But more than that, it is a love that is manifested in service, and this manifestation is to appear first and foremost within the Christian community. The bulk of the Epistle is commentary on this primary truth, expounding it in relation to the actual situation in the Corinthian Church.

The leading facts which prompted the writing of the letter are familiar enough. From three different sources Paul had information about the state of affairs in this congregation of his own foundation and nurture. And the tidings were of a sort to arouse deep misgivings. The Corinthians had learned only too well the meaning of freedom. They were keen enough on the speculative side. There was no lack of fervour in their meetings for worship. But there was a distressing failure to

realize the practical implications of the new faith in the conduct of life. The household of Chloe brought news of party faction in the Church, of loose living among some of the members, of Christians suing one another in the civil courts. A letter from the community revealed difference of opinion about marriage and the relation between the sexes generally, about the attitude to be taken towards paganism, especially in the matter of meat which had been offered in heathen sacrifice, about the place in public worship of that curious phenomenon 'speaking with tongues.' The bearers of the letter had to report that there were other disagreeable features about the meetings for worship, and that there were those in the Church who denied the resurrection of the dead.

With all these points the Apostle deals faithfully in the course of his letter; and behind all the discussion of details lies the solid fact that Christianity is a life to be lived by the rule of service in love, and that within the fellowship of the brethren. Many of the points raised are remote from us. The question of meat offered to idols is not one that is of any, except academic, interest to European Christians to-day. Few congregations are disturbed by outbursts of *glossolalia*. The discussion about virgins (7²⁵⁻⁴⁰) deals with a matter so far removed from our experience that it is impossible to do more than guess what it is that is being discussed. Times have changed, and Christian people to-day are faced by new problems; but it can hardly be doubted that, if Paul were living in this twentieth century, he would be as determined now as he was then that his fundamental principle should be as honestly and fearlessly applied to our problems to-day as he applied it to local Corinthian problems in the first century. And without doubt we ought to do it ourselves. But—and this is a matter of real importance—we ought to use judgment and have an eye for the things that really matter in the doing of it.

It is, for example, only too easy to read Paul's denunciation of party strife at Corinth and apply the denunciation without more ado to what it is the fashion nowadays to call 'our unhappy divisions.' It is easy to realize the scorn with which Paul treats the party cries: 'I am of Paul,' 'I am of Apollos,' 'I am of Cephas,' and then ask what the Apostle would have said to 'I am of Calvin,' 'I am of Wesley,' 'I am for the Councils of the undivided Church.' It is all the more necessary to remember that on questions of principle, as, for example, those treated in Gal., Paul could be and was as inflexible as the most bigoted Pro-

estant or the most fanatical Catholic. What did stir him to indignation was the sight of the Church being split, not on fundamental issues, but on the fashions and fancies of the moment. On a question like that of the liability of Gentile Christians to observe the Jewish Law, Paul maintained that one view was definitely right and the other definitely wrong; and he was ready to fight to a finish for his own view. On the issue Paul *v.* Apollos he is equally clear that both parties are wrong, and that the making of such a matter into a party issue serves merely to impoverish the spiritual life of those concerned (3²¹). Some of the questions that divide the Church to-day are every bit as fundamental as the Galatian issue: some are as childish and frivolous as the Paul-Apollos question at Corinth. And if the first four chapters of 1 Co. have one message more important than any other for a divided Church, it is that we should take stock of our convictions and prejudices to find out what are the things that really go to the root of the matter, and what are simply things of custom, fashion, or personal preference. There are, in fact, two ways of committing the sin of schism. One consists in taking the wrong side on a matter of principle, and sticking to it when it has been shown to be wrong. The other consists in treating matters of merely temporary or local or personal interest as if they were matters of life and death. And of the two the second is certainly the more stupid: it is an open question whether it is not also the more mischievous.

Closely allied to this business of making theological mountains out of ecclesiastical molehills is the doctrinaire treatment of questions of conduct. At Corinth there were those who wanted to carry through Paul's doctrine of freedom with a high hand. Later, at Colossæ, he had to contend with those who ran to the opposite extreme and plastered life with prohibitory notices: 'Touch not, taste not, handle not.' It is instructive to observe how Paul, while maintaining his own high idea of Christian liberty, yet insists that there is a Christian way of using Christian liberty; and that the Christian way is to see one's liberty as something to be enjoyed *in the fellowship*, and exercised in such ways as will serve the brethren in love. His solution does not involve the sacrifice of freedom in the least degree. Neither does it mean riding roughshod over the weaknesses or prejudices of others. It is rather the bringing of a quickened conscience to the use of freedom in every single case.

We may ask, for instance, about Paul's attitude

on what we call the 'temperance' question. We shall get no direct guidance from 1 Co., since it happens that the burning question at Corinth was not about drink but about meat. Yet from Paul's treatment of the meat question we may learn something that will help us to face the drink question or any other of the same sort.

The meat question at Corinth arose from the fact that a large part of the flesh of animals sacrificed in the heathen temples found its way to the butchers' shops for sale. To tender consciences the purchase or use of this meat was equivalent to countenancing idolatry, if not to supporting and taking part in it. The more enlightened members of the community could not see any difficulty. What should the enlightened do?

Paul's discussion of this question (8-10) is complicated by the fact that he holds two apparently inconsistent views about the nature of idol-worship. The one view, deriving ultimately from the great Prophets of the Old Testament, is that there is no God but one, and that an idol is nothing at all (8⁴). The other equates idol-worship with the worship of demons (10^{20f.}). The explanation of the discrepancy may perhaps be found in the fact that Paul was both a theologian and a missionary. As theologian he knew that the pagan deities were nonentities: as missionary he knew that nevertheless they represented a real and present peril to the souls of those who believed in them, or were but newly won from that belief. We may, I think, safely assume that Paul's real conviction was that the idol is nothing in the world.

If, then, the idol is nothing, the meat is neither better nor worse for having been laid on the altar, and the Christian, who knows that, may eat of it to his heart's content. He is completely free. But having established this Paul at once goes on to say: 'But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to the weak' (8⁹). And in ch. 10 he uses examples drawn from the Old Testament to show that a reckless use of his freedom may be a serious danger to the man himself. The upshot is that, while in every case the Christian is free to eat, in every case he must ask himself in all seriousness what effect his eating in this instance will have upon other brethren in the way of helping or hindering them in their Christian life. There is not, and cannot be, any hard-and-fast rule—to eat or not to eat. There is simply the assertion of Christian freedom and, along with it, the equally firm assertion of the obligation to use that Christian freedom in the Christian way, which is the way of serving the brethren in love.

The same foundation principles of the Christian life appear yet again in the case considered in ch. 6. Church members are bringing actions against one another in the civil courts. Paul's objection is not that the civil court is unlikely to give a just judgment. It is not that it is bad publicity for the Church when members wash their dirty linen in public. What he finds astonishing, even horrifying, is the implication that there is not inside the Church a strong enough sense of justice and brotherly love to produce a fair settlement of any difference between two members, without recourse to an outside agency. More astonishing, more horrible, still is the thought that disputes of this character can arise at all between men who are brethren in Christ. Such things are sacrilegious. They break the first rule of Christian living. They dismember the body of Christ, and that from the meanest of all motives—monetary gain.

Again, in the worship of the community, at the Lord's Table even, there are divisions (11¹⁸). And these divisions are the signs of a failure to keep the rule of service in love. The Lord's Supper, which ought to be the supreme demonstration of the unity of the fellowship, becomes instead a manifestation of economic distinctions. The well-to-do turn it into a feast for themselves: the poorer brethren go hungry (11²¹). All this is what Paul calls the failure 'to discern the body' (11²⁹), that is, to realize the organic unity of all the members in Christ, with its obligation to share and help.

The worship of the Corinthian community was marked by a remarkable fervour, which manifested itself especially in the phenomenon of *glossolalia*, the utterance of incoherent sounds which were regarded as evidence of possession by the Spirit. That being so, it was natural that those who had this gift of 'speaking with tongues' should be regarded as specially favoured and perhaps worthy of special consideration, that the most important personages in the Church should be, not those who gave the most service, but those who showed the greatest proficiency in talking gibberish. Paul speaks about it more politely than that; but it is plain that he did not regard speaking with tongues as a particularly useful contribution to the public worship of the Church, or as a valuable instrument for effecting the conversion of unbelievers. But the real objection to unlimited *glossolalia* was not that it was wild and fantastical. It was simply that it brought no spiritual benefit to any one but its possessor. It did not serve the brethren. It did not build up the body of Christ in the same way that simple preaching in a known tongue did.

It is in this connexion that Paul introduces and works out the great analogy between the Church and a living body (12); and it is in this connexion too that he utters his great hymn in praise of love (13). At these points his argument becomes most convincing, his appeal most persuasive. Any one, it seems, who can understand the figure must see that the unity of the Church and the service of the brethren go hand in hand. Any one who has felt the appeal of the poem must know of a certainty that love is the secret of the Christian life. Here and nowhere else the meaning of life's tasks is to be found, and the solution of life's problems. All the details of conduct in the complex relations of man to man, in the constantly changing context of outward circumstances—all can be and should be brought to the simple test of service of the brethren in love. The questionings and even the failures of the Corinthian Church have, one by one, brought out more clearly the picture of the ideal Church as a living body whose health and strength are service, whose life-blood is love. The last big question—that of the Resurrection—enables Paul to place his figure of the Church against a wider background.

For the question of the Resurrection, as Paul treats it, ceases to be merely a matter of what will happen to men and women after death, and becomes a question about the whole meaning of the life of the Christian as part of a Divine plan, whose fulfilment lies still in the future. For the Greek mind the immortality of the soul meant, so far as it meant anything worth looking forward to, escape, release from the hampering conditions of an earthly body and a material environment. The soul freed from the trammels of mundane existence would find its true blessedness in the contemplation of the static timeless ideas. For Paul resurrection means in some real sense victory, not an escape from the body, but a transformation of it into something glorious and incorruptible. And this consummation is part and parcel of Christ's victory over all that is contrary to the purpose of God. It is the privilege of those that are Christ's to share in this victory when it is won, and also to share in the conflict by which it is being won. And so the whole life of the believer takes on a new meaning. His daily effort to realize in his own life the Christian rule of service in love is seen as his share in the working out of a purpose that is as wide as the world and as deep as the thought of God. The living of the Christian life is not merely self-realization: it is co-operation with Christ in the remoulding of all things according to God's desire. Hence it

is not surprising to find that the upshot of the 15th ch. of this Epistle is not that Christians should sit with folded hands waiting to be released from this evil world, but, in Paul's own words: 'Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know your labour is not vain in the Lord' (15⁵⁸).

So the letter draws to its close. The last chapter is filled with all the odds and ends that find their place at the end of a letter. But even among these scraps the main message of the Epistle still finds a place. When Paul begs the Corinthian Church to hold the household of Stephanas in specially high regard, it is because 'they have set themselves to minister unto the saints' (16¹⁵). Almost the last word to the community is: 'Let all that ye do be done in love' (16¹⁴); and the last word is: 'My love be with you all in Christ Jesus' (16²⁴).

1 Co. is a letter impossible to summarize, just because it is the most 'practical' of all the Epistles. But in all the variety of the detailed questions discussed by the Apostle it is possible to see clearly enough the principle which he uses for the solution of all of them. That principle is that the one thing that a Christian has to give to his neighbour is love, and that the way of giving it is the way of devoted unselfish service. He argues for this principle in case after case. He does more than that. He offers his own life as an example of at least one honest attempt to put the principle into practice: 'I have made myself servant unto all' (9¹⁹). Beside 'Let all that ye do be done in love,' he writes, 'My love be with you all in Christ Jesus.' And all this is essentially the imitation of Christ Jesus Himself, who said: 'He that would be chief among you must be servant of all,' and: 'I am among you as one that serveth.'

Miracles in the Gospels.

BY THE REVEREND C. H. DODD, M.A., D.D., RYLANDS PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND EXEGESIS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

'SALVATION,' says the writer to the Hebrews,¹ 'was first declared by the Lord, and it was certified to us by those who heard Him, while God confirmed their testimony by signs, prodigies, various acts of power, and distributions of Holy Spirit according to His will.' That is a description of actual experience shared by the author and his readers in the second generation of Christianity. Twenty years or so earlier, Paul had written to the Galatians, 'When God grants you the Spirit, and performs acts of power among you, is it the result of behaviour according to law, or of the proclamation of faith?'² Once again, 'acts of power' (or, as we should say, miracles) are a *datum* of experience. In offering to the Romans the credentials of his ministry, Paul says: 'I will not venture to speak of anything but what Christ has achieved through me for the conversion of the Gentiles by word and deed, by the power of signs and prodigies, by the power of Holy Spirit.'³ We could not ask for better first-hand evidence that in the early Christian Church events which were regarded as miraculous were a matter of common experience.

Miracles, then, in the context of early Christian thought, are a function of the corporate life of the Church as moved by the Spirit. The universal postulate of the New Testament is that the presence of the Spirit in all its manifestations is the proof that Christians are living in the New Age. The primitive preaching declared that the evident facts of the life of the Church ('that which you see and hear') are the realization of 'that which was spoken of by the prophet,' who announced the approach of the 'great and terrible day of the Lord.'⁴

Many Jewish thinkers regarded the existing state of things as a provisional one, in which, though the Most High had all authority in the kingdom of men,⁵ yet normally there was no direct interposition of His power in the affairs of earth. That direct interposition was reserved for the Good Time Coming. Thus they looked forward to an age of supernatural power, an age of miracle, in which the presence of God among men would be a matter of everyday experience. They described it in terms of fantasy (for as yet it could only be so described, since no man had experience of it). The very earth

¹ He 2³.⁴

² Gal 3².

³ Ro 15¹⁸, 19.

⁴ Ac 2¹⁵⁻²³.

⁵ Dn 4¹⁷.

would be changed: 'for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert.' Human sufferings and disabilities would be removed: the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped: then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing.¹ Prophetic vision and utterance would become general: 'your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams.'² Along with all this there would be a moral and spiritual renewal of God's people: 'A new spirit will I put within you, and I will take the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh, and cause you to walk in my statutes.'³

Early Christianity declared that all this had come true. 'If any man is in Christ,' says Paul, 'there is a new creation. Old things have passed away: new things have come into being.'⁴ The whole life of the Christian community is a miracle, in which the Spirit of God is manifestly at work. Its varying manifestations Paul ranges in a sort of hierarchy of 'spiritual gifts.' In this hierarchy the ethical miracle of 'charity' or 'love' takes the supreme rank. Acts of power and gifts of healing have a relatively modest place, below prophecy, and along with assistance given to weak members of the community, and guidance of its affairs. At the bottom of the list comes a sheer prodigy like speaking with tongues.⁵ No other early Christian thinker, probably, saw the matter with such clarity, but Paul surely interprets the common experience. The Christians of the New Testament period had a definite sense of living, morally and spiritually, in a supernatural environment. That sense of a supernatural environment coloured their whole reaction to life. We may leave for the present the question whether this means that it led to their doing things or which there is no natural explanation, or whether it only led them to interpret as sheer miracle, events which were well within the natural order. The point is that in the New Testament 'acts of power, signs, and prodigies' have their place in a life which is supernatural through and through. They are not casual or arbitrary intrusions of the supernatural into the orderly course of the natural. Whatever our analysis may make of reputed 'miracles,' in the New Testament, for those who worked or witnessed them, they symbolized the radical miracle of the 'new creation' which they experienced 'in Christ.'

For all New Testament writers the centre of this

supernatural order is Christ Himself. If the miraculous is a quality of the life of the Church, the basic miracle is the coming of Christ as Lord of the New Age. Paul, as we have seen, appeals to the 'signs and prodigies' which accompanied his mission as its credentials. But when he is faced with Jews who 'demand signs' as a condition of accepting the gospel, he will adduce no particular 'act of power' (*δύναμις*): 'we preach,' he says, 'Christ, the power (*δύναμις*) of God'—Christ, the ultimate miracle.⁶

Here, again, Paul is expressing, with the clarity and profundity which set him apart among early Christian thinkers, the common conviction. The primitive preaching puts it more crudely: 'God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with Holy Spirit and power, and He went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil, because God was with Him.'⁷ It was, as the most recent critics emphasize, out of this primitive preaching of Christ as Lord of the New Age that the Gospels grew. We see at once that it was inevitable that the story of the Gospels should be a story of supernatural events. The idea of miracle⁸ in the primitive Church, as we have seen, is an outgrowth of apocalyptic eschatology. The miraculous becomes actual as eschatology moves from the future to the present. The life of Christ was for His earliest followers a realized apocalypse, and in this sense they told His story, as the Divine answer to the age-long prayer of those who waited for the Kingdom of God: 'Awake, awake, put on strength, O Arm of the Lord!' 'Oh that Thou wouldst rend the heavens and come down!' In the time-honoured symbolism of prophets and apocalyptists they tell how the eyes of the blind have been opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped; the lame man leaps as an hart; the tongue of the dumb sings; the captive prey of the mighty is delivered;⁹ the footsteps of the Lord are upon the waters; He makes the storm a calm; He gives His people bread from heaven to eat; He awakes them that sleep in the dust.¹⁰ As we should expect, there is hardly a miracle narrated which does not correspond to something in the traditional apocalyptic imagery. In various ways the Gospels are saying all the time: 'Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see; for many prophets and kings desired to see the things that ye see, and saw them not!'¹¹ In a word, 'The kingdom of God has come upon you.' The

⁶ 1 Co 1²²⁻²⁴.

⁷ Ac 10³⁸.

⁸ *I.e.* the concept of the miraculous, whatever were the facts which they interpreted through it.

⁹ Mk 3²⁷; cf. Is 49²⁶.

¹⁰ Dn 12².

¹¹ Lk 10¹²⁻²⁴.

¹ Is 35. ² Joel 2²⁸, as quoted in Ac 2¹⁷.

³ Ezk 36^{26, 27}.

⁴ 2 Co 5¹⁷.

⁵ 1 Co 12²⁷⁻¹³.

apocalyptic hope has come true. All the miracle-stories are variations on this theme.

From this we can at once draw the inference that two methods of dealing with the miracles, which are or have been popular, fail to do justice to their real significance in the Gospels.

First, they cannot be treated as objective evidence for the supernatural status and powers of Christ. The miracle-stories, in their existing form and setting, are the product of a prior belief in Christ as Lord of the New Age. That belief is presented to us in the New Testament primarily as a matter of spiritual experience or intuition. We may accept it as such, and read the miracle-stories in its light ; or we may reject it as fantasy, and the miracle-stories with it. We cannot treat them as objective and independent evidence, from which we can draw our own conclusions, corroborating, or on the other hand confuting, the spiritual intuition of the first Christians.

Secondly, if we simply rationalize the miracle-stories, and leave it at that, we deprive them of that quality which gives them their place in the gospel. Suppose we say, with many liberal commentators, Jesus cannot have fed five thousand with five loaves, so that all were filled ; but perhaps the crowd was smaller ; perhaps some of them, too, had loaves which He induced them to share ; and perhaps the influence of His words made them feel satisfied with a very small share for each. No doubt it may have happened so. But told in that way, the story ceases to have serious relevance to the gospel. The Fourth Evangelist has shown us a better way. In reading this story, he says in effect, you should not think of loaves and fishes, or of any material food, however miraculous (' manna,' for example). You should find in it a ' sign,'¹ a symbol that is, of the fact that when Christ came, the true bread from heaven was given to men, by which they have eternal life.² There is still a question to be answered, and a question of fact, but it is no longer, Did Jesus on a day make five loaves satisfy five thousand people, or if not, what modifications of these proportions will make the tale credible ? But, Did Jesus really bring a new kind of spiritual life into the world, and can we still live by it ? That is a serious question : the other is trivial in comparison.

It may be objected, that this is merely going back to the old bad method of allegorical interpretation. But there is a right and a wrong use of such methods of interpretation. If the interpretation of the symbolism is irresponsible and arbitrary, it clouds

the meaning of Scripture. But if it is based on a study of the intention of the authors of the story, of their environment, and of the ideas that controlled their writing, then it may be truly illuminating. That this particular narrative was intended to be read with an inner meaning even Mark hints pretty clearly when he says, ' They did not understand about the loaves, because their mind was dulled.'³ Whatever act of Jesus gave rise to the story was very likely intended as a symbolical act such as those which the Old Testament prophets frequently performed. But in any case the form in which the story became a treasured possession of the Christian mind carried this symbolical import ; and this determines the real historical significance of the event, whatever may actually have happened.

It is not every miracle-story which thus carries a particular symbolical suggestion of its own ; but they all, taken together, carry the suggestion of a life once lived which inaugurated a supernatural experience for men ; and unless we hold the early Christians to have been deluded in supposing that the power of God had opened the gates of new life to them in Christ, we must find here the fundamental truth of the miracle-stories. They are historical in that they set before us, it may be in no more than a sort of symbolic cryptogram, the important fact that such a life was lived, and that its effects were of that kind.

The historical status of the stories as ostensible records of particular incidents is another question. Did Jesus really work the miracles attributed to Him ?

In saying that the miracle-stories are symbolic we have not prejudged this question, for although there is a mythopœic tendency in the human mind yet the human mind also habitually seeks the spiritual significance of real events, and by doing so gives them their place in history. Thus Tennyson took the Charge of the Light Brigade, and made it a permanent symbol of disciplined and unreasoning courage. But it was a real event. Certainly when the evangelists told the miracle-stories they at least conceived themselves to be recording facts—and facts of the same order as the ' acts of power, signs, and prodigies ' to which they were accustomed as features of the corporate life of the Church. It is indeed quite conceivable that (as radical critics would maintain) we have no single story of a miracle trustworthy in an historical sense. But even so we should still be obliged to believe that Jesus appeared to His contemporaries as a miracle-worker

¹ Jn 6²⁸.

² Jn 6³¹⁻³³.

³ Mk 6⁵² 8¹⁷⁻²¹.

like many other religious personalities of His time, Jewish and pagan. We have not only Christian testimony. The Talmud preserves the tradition that 'Jesus of Nazareth practised sorcery and beguiled and led astray Israel.'¹ We may therefore safely say that Jesus did work what His contemporaries regarded as miracles.

Further, it is held by many recent critics that the tradition of the words of Jesus is on the whole more trustworthy than that of His deeds. It is therefore important to observe that there are sayings attested by our best sources which seem to countenance the miraculous interpretation put upon certain phenomena in the life of Jesus by His followers. Thus, 'if I by the finger of God cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you'²; 'go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind see, the lame walk . . .'³ etc. Apparently, therefore, we must add that Jesus too believed that He worked miracles.

The miraculous, therefore, is an inseparable element of the gospel narrative as a whole. Any knowledge we have of the life and teaching of Jesus rests upon sources which record miracles. It would be generally agreed nowadays that this does not in itself discredit the Gospels as historical documents, any more than Livy or Tacitus is discredited by the prodigies he relates. If we turn to particular miracle-stories, and attempt to assess the value of their attestation, we find that they vary just as non-miraculous stories do. Every one of the main strata recognized by recent criticism contains miracles, and while there is an undoubted tendency to heighten the marvellous element, yet in our oldest and best sources there are stories substantially no less marvellous than in the latest.⁴ The reason why, for example, we readily believe Mark when he tells us that Jesus was a carpenter, and was condemned to death by Pontius Pilate, but hesitate

to believe Mark when he tells us that Jesus stilled a storm and fed five thousand with five loaves, is that these latter statements do not fit in with our general conception of the universe. If nowadays many people are prepared to accept the stories of healing and exorcism as substantially historical, whereas critics half a century ago treated them as legendary, it is not because we are more ready to accept an event which interrupts the uniformity of Nature, but because we now have direct scientific evidence from our own time of cures effected in cases not unlike those described in the Gospels, by means not unlike those ascribed to Jesus, and consequently we can regard these particular incidents as non-miraculous. The judgment that the healings and exorcisms are non-miraculous and historical, and the 'nature-miracles' legendary, is not warranted by any difference in the attestation of the two types of miracle-story.

The presupposition behind such a judgment is that if a miracle involves the suspension of natural laws, or a breach of the uniformity of Nature, then miracles do not happen. It is, however, legitimate to point out, as has often been done, that the formulation of laws of Nature rests on an abstraction. The uniformity of Nature may be stated in the form, 'The like cause always produces the like effect.' But in concrete reality no two events are exactly alike in all respects. Science has made progress by mapping out reality into fields in which it can isolate causes which are alike in all relevant respects, and trace effects which are alike in all relevant respects. But concrete reality as it enters into experience is not parcelled out into separate fields, but is continuous, and an element which in one field of science is irrelevant may in another field be relevant. Thus living bodies, like all other forms of matter, are studied by the sciences of physics and chemistry, but these sciences do not deal with every aspect of living bodies. As living, they are studied by biology. Similarly, when the behaviour of man and other animals is studied by biology, there is an aspect of it which is irrelevant to biology, but becomes the subject-matter of psychology. In the phenomena of life, there is nothing which infringes or suspends the laws of physics and chemistry; and in the phenomena of mind there is nothing which infringes the laws of biology; but in each case those laws operate in different combinations due to the presence of a special factor which is irrelevant to the 'lower' science, but relevant to the 'higher.' If there should be a still higher order which stands to the whole 'natural' order somewhat as mind stands to the phenomena of life, and life to the

¹ Baraita in *Sanh.* 43a, see Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 27.

² Lk 11²⁰, Mt 12²⁸. ³ Lk 7²², Mt 11⁴.

⁴ There are indeed no 'nature-miracles' in 'Q'; but it is, so to speak, an accident that 'Q' has any stories at all; it was apparently a collection of sayings, though it incidentally gives an exorcism and a cure at a distance, as well as the supernatural occurrences at the Baptism and the Temptation, and a saying which alludes to the raising of the dead. If we rationalize these, it is on our own responsibility. The hypothetical 'Proto-Luke' is also said to have no 'nature-miracles'; but any reconstruction of this document gives us a source probably no earlier than Mark, and certainly inferior to it. The better source therefore, in this case, does give such miracles.

physical and chemical aspects of reality, then it might well be that the laws of the whole 'natural' order might operate in certain cases in combinations not wholly explicable by natural science. But whereas we look at the whole 'natural' order downward from its summit, we should *ex hypothesi* look at this 'supernatural' order from below upwards, somewhat as an organism in which mind is only rudimentary might observe the strange behaviour of intelligent beings. While therefore we can see, from our vantage-point, how the lower aspects of reality, with their laws, are subsumed under the higher aspects, with their laws, we should not be able to do more than divine how the 'supernatural' order would produce fresh combinations within the 'natural' order. At any point, therefore, where this hypothetical 'supernatural' order impinged on 'nature,' it might *appear* that there was something like a suspension of natural law.

The question we have to ask is whether there is reason to believe that such a higher order exists and impinges on the order of Nature. The question is answered in the affirmative for religious persons who believe in a God who is not only immanent in the order of Nature, but transcends it. Unless expressions like 'the grace of God,' 'divine guidance,' 'answer to prayer' are mere figures of speech, they mean that a higher order impinges upon our life within the order of space, time, and matter, and produces effects within that order. It does not suspend the operation of any biological or psychological law, but it introduces a fresh factor. As we know that such experiences do form real crises in individual lives, it is not absurd to suppose that there may be real crises in history in which the powers of the higher order impinge upon the natural order of human life, not in a lawless way, but by enriching the total situation with new factors. Within such a situation it is not inconceivable that unusual events might occur which could be only partly accounted for by known laws of Nature.

But while this may be so, in such a situation the subject of religious experience is apt not to ask narrowly whether or not he can explain the thing that has happened to him. He is too much pre-occupied with the direct conviction of the grace and power of God in his experience. That is to say, the *differentia* of miracle, in a religious way of speaking, is not its inexplicability, but its effect in bringing to the person who experiences it an unusual sense of the supernatural, that is, of the presence and power of God.

Now if we read the Gospels we observe how the miracle-stories in general move in an atmosphere

of the 'numinous.' Their very vocabulary is of the kind which Otto has shown to be characteristic of 'numinous' experience—they were amazed,' 'afraid,' 'dumbfounded,'—ἐξέστησαν, ἐφοβούντο, ἐθαμβήθησαν,¹—and so forth. If we rationalize the stories of healing, and recognize in them analogues of psychological healing familiar to us, there yet remains in the stories this 'numinous' element. If Jesus cast out demons, so, we are told, did the Pharisees; so do exorcists in India and China to-day; and so, we may add, do psychotherapists among ourselves, though their descriptive terminology is different. Such cases are remarkable, but not inexplicable. But when Jesus cast out demons, there was something about it which made people feel that 'the finger of God' was at work, and His Kingdom was there. The same 'numinous' verb θαμβέσθαι is used also of the effect of the words of Jesus,² of the feelings of His disciples when He led them to Jerusalem,³ and of the effect of His mere presence.⁴ This atmosphere is an ineradicable feature of the gospel narratives.

The sense of the 'numinous' may be described as the feeling tone which accompanies a conviction, true or false, of the presence of the supernatural. That this conviction was true in the case we are considering is far from being proved by the miracles, as we have seen; but if on other grounds we are prepared to say it was true, then we come back to the position of the New Testament writers as set forth at the beginning of this article. The whole story moves within an historical setting in which the supernatural is a real factor. Within that setting every event may have a double aspect. It exhibits the working of ordinary natural laws, but it exhibits it sometimes in unusual combinations due to a supernatural factor. In studying the record of the events, we shall try as far as possible to understand the natural laws of work, as, for instance, the known laws of psychological suggestion. But we shall not, in doing so, ignore the other factor which set them to work in this particular way. And we shall not proceed with the cast-iron assumption that in these unusual combinations we shall always be able to account for the whole fact on the basis of our present knowledge, or that we must reject the story if we cannot. The course which the criticism of the stories of exorcism has taken, should warn us against such a premature closing of the question.

To sum up: in dealing critically and historically

¹ Otto, *Das Heilige*,⁸ p. 29, n. 1, puts down the root *thamb* as one of the simple, onomatopœic expressions of 'numinous' feeling.

² Mk 10²⁴.

³ Mk 10³².

⁴ Mk 9¹⁵.

with any given miracle-story, for example, an exorcism, the feeding of the multitude, or the empty tomb, we should proceed as follows :

- (i) recognize the value of the story as a symbolic statement of the fundamental conviction of those who told it, that the true supernatural, the Divine power to re-create the life of men, had entered into their experience ;
- (ii) recognize the implications of the story for the total effect produced by the personality of Jesus upon those who knew Him ;
- (iii) passing on to the question of the factual status of the story, trace and estimate the ultimate source from which it is drawn, and so far as possible restate it in its earliest attainable form ;
- (iv) account for the event on the basis of known natural laws, so far as this can be done without doing violence to the record, acknowledging that in doing so we are not accounting for the whole story, as we have it ;
- (v) where we come to the limits of our present knowledge, admit it, and allowing for all possible operation of the mythopœic tendency in such an environment, suspend judgment as to the ultimate verdict of history.

All these five points belong to an historical treatment. But if the aim of our study of the Gospels is to come through history to religion, points i and ii are of primary importance ; points iii, iv, and v secondary. It might be said that if we could prove such a miracle as that of the empty tomb to be factually true, it would carry with it religiously important implications regarding God's dealings with His world. But such proof could be forthcoming only if our knowledge so increased that this event could be brought into relation with the rest of our scientific knowledge of the world, and so ceased to be, in the ordinary sense of the word, miraculous. On the other hand, it is religiously important to recognize that events did happen in the life of Jesus, which, in their total setting, produced on men's minds the impression represented by the miracle-stories ; an impression of the personality of Jesus in relation to the situation in which He moved ; an impression of His freedom, boldness, and serenity in the face of the evils of this world, an impression of mastery over the whole situation, an impression of Divine compassion and authority, an impression of supernatural creative power over the lives of men, and finally the impression that His whole history made a crisis in which the power of God ushered in a New Age for the spirit of man.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Keep your End up !

BY THE REVEREND H. CLOUGH WEAVER, M.A.,
HOUNSLOW.

'Ye also helping.'—2 Co 1¹¹.

Most boys in England know the name of the Rev. J. H. Parsons, who made 190 against the New Zealanders a few years ago. Some little time before he became a clergyman, when he was a regular member of the Warwickshire eleven, I saw him play in a very interesting game.

Warwickshire was playing Sussex, on the Sussex ground at Hove. Warwick batted first, and four men were out for 131—four of their best bats. There was only one left who could be relied on to make runs, and this was Parsons. The question

was whether he could get any one to stay with him long enough for him to raise the score to something respectable.

The next man came in, and went after making three ; the next to him made one. His successor did a little better, and managed a score of six, but the following two were each out for a duck. None of them stayed long, and that was the real trouble. Then the last man came in. Warwick had scored 190, and Parsons had made 80 of them.

The last man was Harry Howell, a famous bowler, who played for England in his time, but his best friend wouldn't have called him much of a bat. But he stuck at the wicket, although he had some of the best bowling in England against him ; and though he didn't make many runs himself—only nine—he stayed long enough for Parsons to make his century. There was a great cheer then, even from

a crowd that naturally favoured the other side ; and in the end, Parsons got 109, and his side 235—a respectable score, and one that proved sufficient for Warwickshire to win the match.

That last man didn't do very much himself, but he kept his end up and enabled his partner to do a great deal.

The same kind of thing is done elsewhere than on the cricket field.

All of you, I expect, have used Lever Brothers' soaps—Sunlight, Lifebuoy, and the rest of them. That great firm was started by a man named William Lever in a little grocer's shop in Bolton ; he ended by being the biggest soap-maker in the world, and became Sir William Lever, and afterwards Lord Leverhulme. And in Port Sunlight, the firm's model village near Birkenhead, there's an Art Gallery named after Lady Lever. She died before it was built, but at the opening Lord Leverhulme said about her : ' I am convinced that without her great influence there would have been neither a Port Sunlight nor a Lever Brothers. Not that she ever did anything in the business or planned the model village ; but it came because of the confidence she inspired in me.' She too, you see, kept her end up, and so enabled her husband to do great things.

Some of you may be missionary collectors. Yours is not the most important bit of work ; the missionary overseas is doing that. But if you do your bit, and keep your end up, you enable him to do his great work, and he could not do it without your help. Some day, perhaps, you may be called to go to another country and do the great work of a missionary yourself ; and then you will need the help of boys and girls at home, who will keep their end up while you preach the gospel abroad.

Most of you belong to a Sunday school. The biggest job there is the Superintendent's, and after him come the other officers and the teachers ; but all of them by themselves cannot make a model school. That needs your help, and it can't be done without you. Your part in the making of the school may not be a very large one, but if you keep your end up, you will be helping them to do the great work of making a school that is all it ought to be. And your share is essential.

Be a star if you can, and do some important piece of work. But if the opportunity to be a star doesn't come yet awhile, remember that if at home, or at school, or wherever else you may be, you play your smaller part, you will be helping some one else to do something big, and something that couldn't be done except with your aid.

Shadows.

By MR. ARTHUR J. MEE, M.A., B.Sc., CHELTENHAM

' He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.'—Ps 91¹.

Are you ever alone ? You may think you are. Your mother and father go out of the room, and leave you—all alone. You are sent out on an errand, and you go by yourself—all alone. But are you really alone ? No, you are always accompanied by something. Sometimes it is a little way behind you, sometimes it gets a little way in front, but it is never far away from you. It is something you can never touch, something you can never catch. If you run after it, it too goes faster, and sometimes has a habit of turning round, and before you know where you are you find it is behind you. Yes, it is your own peculiar friend—your shadow. It is yours, and nobody else has one quite like it. You can see your shadow much more clearly on a sunny day than you can on a dull one, but even on a dull day you have a shadow. It may be slight, but it's there.

You may think that a shadow is nothing much to talk about, and that it is not worth our while to bother our heads about it ; and yet, you know some shadows have been useful. The shadow of a tree, for instance, is very useful to us on a hot day. But sometimes the shadows of people may be important to us. Let me tell you about Peter's shadow. Peter had been carrying out some wonderful miracles of healing, just as his Master Jesus Christ had done. Naturally the people were very anxious to get their friends and relatives who were ill into the presence of Peter so that he might heal them. There were so many of them, however, that it was quite impossible for Peter to get to all of them to touch them, and it was equally difficult for them to make their way to Peter. So what did they do ? Well, they put the sick people out into the streets on beds and couches so that ' at least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them.' Those people whom Peter's shadow touched were made well. Peter's shadow was obviously something good. It was a good thing if you could get in it if you were ill.

But some people think that other people's shadows are bad, and bring them bad luck. For example, in India, the people belong to different classes which are called castes. A man of high caste will not eat his food if the shadow of a man of low caste has passed over it. He thinks it is contaminated, that it has been spoilt just because

the shadow has come over it. Of course, we know that this is foolish, but there you are, there are people who believe it.

We are all casting shadows. Every day our body casts its shadow; but our life, too, casts its shadow, which falls on other people. This shadow is our influence. It is the power we have of altering other people's courses of action because they have come into contact with our lives. You have a tremendous power in this way. Have you ever thought how you have affected your friend's conduct by your talk or your actions? Have you ever thought of how his conduct has been altered by his very thinking about you? If you have never thought about these things, try now to think how your own life has been affected by those around you, particularly your father and mother, your teachers at day school and at Sunday school, your brothers and sisters, and your friends. You will find how greatly the shadows of these lives have affected your own. Then you will be able to see how the shadow of your life has influenced those with whom you come into contact. I am sure that you will want your shadow to be a good one—a shadow that brings healing like Peter's, not one that brings dissatisfaction, and bad feeling.

The Christian Year.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Solvent of Sympathy.

'And I sat where they sat, and remained there astonished among them seven days. And it came to pass at the end of seven days, that the word of the Lord came unto me.'—Ezk 3¹⁶.

Ezekiel is a difficult book; but it would be a serious loss to us were we to be turned aside from it because of the difficulties. In the text we come upon a clear patch free from the huge shadows which roll about on this side and that. And as we make as much as we can of this little patch, the entire book becomes clearer and less strange.

Ezekiel's countrymen were in exile in a land which means something to us all to-day—the valley of the Euphrates. And Ezekiel, who, we take it, might have remained at home, went out to see his brethren. He tells us that he set out upon this mission 'in bitterness and in the heat of his spirit.' To be able to grow 'bitter and hot' when the occasion demands it is one of the marks of the Lord Jesus. In course of time he arrived at the place—the bank of a canal in Mesopotamia. And then when

Ezekiel arrived at the place and saw the actual human beings on whom he was preparing to let loose his bitterness and heat, a strange thing happened. Ezekiel, who strikes us as a servant of God who had a good deal to say, said not a word! No words could describe the collapse of the natural man and the rising from the dead of the pure man of God within him, as he himself has described the change: 'I sat where they sat . . . astonished for seven days.' It took Saul of Tarsus three days to get his breath when the truth felled him to the ground outside Damascus. It took Ezekiel seven days.

E. Stanley Jones says in *Christ at the Round Table*, 'I felt no one has a right to teach others who is not learning from them. I came to India with everything to teach and nothing to learn. I now stay to learn as well, and I am a better man for having come into contact with the gentle heart of the East. I think I know now the meaning of Ezekiel's going to the captives by the river to speak to them out of the "heat and bitterness of his spirit" . . . In these Conferences we have tried to understand sympathetically the view-point of the other man—to sit where he sits; and I have been enriched through them. Life can never be quite the same again.'

Perhaps that is why we servants of God are the poor and ineffectual things we are—we speak before we are ready. We will not wait 'till Pentecost.'

When at length, after seven days' silence and humble astonishment, Ezekiel found his voice, the thing he said was something very different from what he had proposed to say. He had gone out to preach to those countrymen of his, to say to them things that he had said elsewhere, things of course which were true enough, but not the very things as he now perceived which come naturally, that is to say, from God, face to face with the actual men.

For seven days he lived with those broken and exiled men. He shared their privations. He listened to what they had to say for themselves. He heard, it may be, their accusations against the accepted order of things. He saw the matter from their standpoint. In a word, and in his own word, he '*sat where they sat*';—and this not for a moment only, in which case a man might get up and forget the horror and hold on to his prejudices. He sat where they sat—for seven days, until by force of sympathy and experience he was one of them.

'I sat where they sat.' Here is the solution

of all our troubles: to see the other's point of view. It is so easy to see things from our own point of view.

It is told in the biography of Sinclair Stevenson of the Irish Presbyterian Mission in Western India, that 'once an old and rather set English clergyman said to him: "I hope that you are praying that all these young people may be brought round to our point of view."'

"No," replied Clair, "I am too busy praying that I may see their point of view."

It is so easy and so natural to cultivate our own point of view, until we quite honestly come to believe that no other is possible or that no other is just. It is here that we begin to invoke the much-abused word 'conscience'—when the fact is, when we use the word 'conscience,' meaning our own private conscience, we really mean nothing more than our own prejudice, our own predominant and habitual appetite or desire. The dictionary itself ought to be enough to teach us that *that* is not conscience which has to do only with our own feelings. The very idea of 'conscience'—*con*, 'along with'; *scio*, 'I know'—the very idea of 'conscience' implies such sober and qualifying ideas as 'consideration,' 'width,' 'patience,' 'sympathy.' The first question that a man—who is proposing to act on 'conscience'—must ask himself is not, 'How is this action of mine going to affect me?' but 'How is this action of mine going to affect others?' And so, St. Paul, you will remember, gave the ruling 'not my conscience, but the others.' And St. Paul had good reason to know the necessity of such a precaution. He admits that he never was so wrong and so cruelly wrong as when he was most conscientious. 'I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things in opposition to the name of Christ.'

But, once again, 'I sat where they sat,' is the formula which alone will heal the breaches by which one human being is divided from another, the breaches also which separate one class in the community from another, and which alienate the nations. Legislation of itself will never do it. Only love will do it: one man sitting where the other has to sit, long enough to know what it means—for seven days—where another man has to sit day in and day out, until he dies!

The principle underlying these words is, like every other principle, inexhaustible. It would lead, in fact, to such sympathy and pity that there is a danger in yielding to it which only a very strong man can resist or can deal with profit-

ably. There is no doubt that if we could sit down for a time where certain other people have to spend their lives, we should lose all power of judgment. We should conclude rather that there is only one attitude for us men and women to take up to one another everywhere; and that ~~the~~ attitude of uninquiring sympathy and reckless forgiveness. We should decide that every one is fighting a hard battle; and that it is never for us to judge. And yet, judge we must. Unless we are simply going to assent to everything being as it is, and, that the only moral action competent for human beings is that they shall be indulgent to one another, we must control ourselves and give some practical issue to our sympathy. And here it is that Ezekiel throws open a door through which we see again, and with fresh eyes and fresh understanding, the moral greatness, the goodness and sheer wisdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. After seven days' silence and humble sympathy, Ezekiel tells us he saw his way. He heard God speaking to him. He saw clearly what henceforward his business must be in this world. And what was it that he saw? What was it that he heard? God's word to him, which he should henceforward pass on or lose his soul? 'Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel.'

The thing which, Ezekiel perceived, God wanted him to say and to keep saying to all men at all times everywhere was this: We live in a moral world, where things are related to one another by indestructible sequences and affinities; little things, such as a spark of fire, to great explosions; as when powers and kingdoms reel: wherefore let every one watch himself lest he in his own speech, or in his own act, or, Christ added, in his own thought, let loose upon the world sinister forces which will combine to cover some generation which in itself was no more guilty than another in an ocean of retributive blood and tears. In other words, the message of Ezekiel in this place is the message which the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ seems above all other messages to proclaim to all mankind, namely, this: that it is only at an infinite cost—and, for the most part, cost to the innocent—that wrong is righted in this world.¹

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Darnel among the Wheat.

'Another parable put he forth unto them saying The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which

¹ J. A. Hutton, *Our Only Safeguard*, 125.

sowed good seed in his field : but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. . . . Let both grow together until the harvest.'—Mt 13²⁴⁻³⁰.

In the Sower it was assumed that the thorns got among the crop by accident. The darnel presents a new case in which the weeds are deliberately sown with hostile intent. Let us ask first what the parable meant to 'Matthew' and the circle for which he wrote. They may have had in mind cases of grave moral delinquency in the Church. Was Paul right, for example, in recommending the communication of the Corinthian Christian who was living with his father's wife ? It seems unlikely that any Gospel writer could ascribe to Jesus the view that no attempt should be made to root iniquity out of the Church.

More probably, the early Church regarded the parable as giving guidance on the treatment to be accorded to Christians who held and taught beliefs that differed from the received teaching of the authorities. There was, for example, the great Pauline heresy, that Gentile believers might be baptized without first being circumcised. The proper treatment for men whose beliefs were considered dangerously erroneous must have been at first a matter for serious discussion. Were they to be tolerated in the Church, or were they to be driven out ? The parable seemed to answer : 'Let the heretics alone. If their teaching is really wrong and dangerous, in due time its true nature will show itself. Let God be the judge.' This was, in fact, the advice which Gamaliel had given the members of the Sanhedrin, when they wanted to root out the evil thorns, Peter and the other Apostles who had defied them. The Jerusalem Council also decided that the uncircumcised Gentile converts might remain in the Church, though some members regarded their membership as a noxious weed. Paul gave the same answer to the same question. If on the foundation any man builds a structure of wood or thatch, there is no need for us to burn it down ; the Day, God's Day, will show it up ; the Fire will bring out its true quality.

But such questions can hardly have been in the mind of Jesus. The opening scene conveys an important and memorable truth. If there are farmers who sow good seed, there are other farmers who sow darnel. In our Lord's day, His disciples were not the only preachers ; Pharisees were scouring sea and land to make proselytes. In our day, if there are missionaries of the Cross, there are also missionaries of the Rationalist Press Association, and there are distinguished novelists and essayists,

often with the most meagre knowledge of what they are discussing, using their influence to discredit the Christian message. While Christian preachers and writers are sowing the seed of lofty thought, pure ideals, and upright conduct, multitudes in the press, in the drink saloon, on the racecourse, in the cheap theatre, with no thought but that of making money from the foibles of their fellow-men, are briskly advertising their wares and sowing the seeds of destruction. And it is not only in the sphere of religion that good seems to be inextricably intertwined with evil. Invention has enlarged the opportunity of the criminal as well as of the respectable citizen, and discovery has smoothed the path of vice as well as of virtue.

But our Lord's thought moved in the moral and spiritual sphere. With the history of His own people in view, He knew how the system of animal sacrifice had attached itself to the Jewish religion, and men at one and the same time could believe that God was righteous and that by the blood of bulls and goats God could be induced to forgive their sins. Pharisaic zeal for the purity of their race and their religion had resulted in the ugly Pharisaism depicted in the Gospels. A genuine desire to have all things clean in the sight of God had been transformed into that ceremonialism which cleansed all the appurtenances of religion—except the heart of the worshipper. The Sabbath rest had become a burden and tithing a mechanical tax.

We have similar experiences in our own day. We have only to look around to see how easily religion, however noble its development, deteriorates till it becomes a parody of its former self. The living Church becomes a dead institution, faith degenerates into a creed, and worship into a repetition of formulæ and ceremonies. The ecclesiastic becomes a poor substitute for the Churchman and the priest for the pastor. The sacrament turns into the mystery, and the joyous reading of the Bible issues in fundamentalism.

Whether or not we have the parable in the precise form in which Jesus gave it, at all events it graphically sets before us three points of great practical importance. There are missionaries of evil as well as missionaries of good ; the evil and the good are intertwined in the closest way, the evil being often, in fact, a parasite of the good ; and rash attempts to destroy the evil may involve the destruction of much of the good. In uprooting the magical element in the sacramentalist's attitude to religion, may we not at the same time destroy his interest in the sacrament ? Convince the fundamentalist

of the intellectual unsoundness of his position, and in some cases he may never again feel the same joyful certainty in reading the old book. Who can tell us the precise point in religion at which the external ends and the internal begins? The architecture, the liturgy, the music, the vestments, beautiful in themselves and rich in historic memories and spiritual significance—can those who regard these things as of the essence of their worship be deprived of them without the quality of their worship being vitally affected? It is a live issue with which this parable deals.

There was much that was revolting in the Judaism of our Lord's day; yet He conducted the whole of His ministry within its confines, and He knew that there was another side to contemporary religion. In the introduction to his Gospel Luke seems anxious to show the reverse side of the picture. There were men like Zechariah and women like Elisabeth in the priestly families as well as the priest who ignored the wounded traveller lying on the Jericho road and the priests who hounded Jesus to His death. In the country there were simple shepherds of unaffected piety with an ear for the heavenly choir. Even in the Temple one might see the doctors amazed at the questions and answers of the child Jesus.

Our Lord did attack the corruptions of Judaism in some of the fiercest denunciations in literature; yet in all His dealings with it He kept in view His own principle that the uprooting of the evil should not endanger the good. He must have loathed the stream of animal blood that flowed in the name of God, yet we nowhere read that He denounced animal sacrifice: He left the system to perish, and it did perish. He knew how far the priests had fallen from the priestly ideal, but He nowhere suggested the abolition of the priesthood. To the last He remained loyal to the Temple in spite of its corruptions. So far was He from proposing to break loose from the whole Judaic system that after He was taken from them His followers still thought of themselves as Jews and continued to worship in the Temple. When the harvest was ripe the separation took place spontaneously.

On every mission field we have learned the wisdom of the warning that, in seeking to lop off rotten branches, we may kill the tree. There are many pious souls to whom a work of destruction is very congenial, but Sodom is not the only city that is worth saving if there are even ten righteous men within it.¹

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Friendship of Jesus.

'I have called you friends.'—Jn 15¹⁵.

A sure sign that truth has been perfectly grasped is that it can be put into words that are simple and clear. Half-knowledge explains things in five syllable words, winds them into long sentences packed into heavy paragraphs. Jesus is dealing with the biggest things of all: truths about God, the meaning of life, Duty, Destiny, the Christian Gospel and the Church—infinately complex, supremely important matters. Yet in a perfectly simple way He handles the most important matters of human spirits ever deal with, so that we can understand them.

1. 'I have called you friends,' means surely that we live in a friendly Universe. Now that is the one fact about it which finally matters. Scores of sciences tell us what a wonderful universe it is: its myriad forms, incredible energies, immeasurable distances: of worlds within the atom as well as worlds infinitely vast. Its treasures are spread out in dazzling profusion—but it is a universe complex, mysterious, and in some aspects cold and terrifying. What we finally want to know about it is: Is it friendly? Mark the ground on which men have stood to find relation with the source of it all—the ground of Fear. The gods are demons or heedless giant deities to be avoided or cajoled with gifts and sacrifices. How many generations have passed all their lifetime in the bondage of fear! Or the ground of Fate, hard, cold mysterious Fate, where the weak despair and the strongest can only offer a stoical resistance.

Now see the ground on which we stand with Christ. The disciples once found Jesus praying *i.e.* seeking communion with the Source of all things, and what they saw made them beg Him to teach them how to pray, and He said: 'A certain man had a Friend...' A certain man—an ordinary man, the least of men—had a Friend. He lived and died in perfect communion with God the Friend.

2. Then Jesus sums up the Christian religion in these words: 'I have called you friends.' Any religion, of course, will have its theology, just as the universe has its sciences, descriptive and applied. So the Christian gospel has its philosophy and ethics—a myriad thoughts and arguments high and deep. But the whole of the Christian theology is in this crystal word. The Christian

¹ J. F. McFadyen, *The Message of the Parables*, 92.

fe is 'fellowship with Jesus and with one another through Him.'

3. The Church is the fellowship of those who are His friends, and are for His sake friends one with another, without question of sex, colour, wealth, race. Friends of Jesus! Now think of the vast complicated machinery of churchmanship, the elaborate creeds, the rigid institutions, the ceremonies, the hierarchies, and supposed 'apostolical successions.' In whose interest is all this set up? To turn from such confusion and complication to the words of Jesus is like passing from a profusely decorated ceiling fifty feet high covered with colours and tortuous hieroglyphics out into the open air where the evening star shines in the deep blue dome high as Infinity.

4. The friendship of Jesus is based on the nature of His life and ours, and is therefore for every man. Sometimes human friendship begins because we sit in the same form at school or hail from the same town. Neighbours and workmates form friendships, some of which are lifelong. But friendship's essence is not in these, but in affinity of soul.

I had a friend that loved me :
He was his soul : he lived not but in me :
We were so close within each other's breast,
The rivets were not found that join'd us first.
That does not reach us yet : we were so mix'd,
As meeting streams—both to ourselves were lost.

We were one mass, we could not give or take,
But from the same : for he was I ; I, he.

Friendship is like chemical fusion, where elements are held together not by rope or nails or wax, but of their nature. In every soul lies something which is made for personal fellowship with God in Christ. What keeps us from Jesus does not really belong to us.

5. Greek art tried to typify real friendship and represented it as a young man, bare-headed and meagrely dressed. The bare head and scanty dress showed him to be active, ready to serve. On his forehead were the words 'Summer and Winter.' The left shoulder and arm were naked to the heart. Upon the fringe of his garment was written 'Death and Life.' With his right hand he pointed to words written over the heart, 'Far and Near.'

Every one who received the friendship of Jesus in His lifetime knew that it had these qualities. He went about doing good. Whom did Jesus ever forsake? The look He turned upon Peter when Peter denied Him was the look of One who was still a friend. 'Having loved his own, he loved

them to the end' was the shining word written many years after His death by one who loved Him most dearly. We often see the imperfections of these men He chose to be His friends—their quarrels amongst themselves, their timidity. One seeks private favours from Him above the others, one denies Him, another betrays Him, and there came an hour when all His friends forsook Him and fled. But when He came amongst them again He said, 'Go tell my brothers—my friends.'

Mr. George Stewart writes in *God and Pain*: 'There would be fewer failures if each person knew there was some one who would be quite heart-broken if he went wrong or failed. In the days of his severest struggles Galsworthy received a letter from a friend who believed in him, which helped to restore his confidence in himself and in the dependability of the world. His friend remarked: "That the man who has written once *The Four Winds* has written now *The Man of Devon* is a source of infinite gratification to me. It vindicates my insight, my opinion, my judgment, and it satisfies my affection for you—in whom I believed and am believing. Because that is the point: I am believing. You've gone now beyond the point where I could be no use to you otherwise than just by my belief."'

6. Any one who will go three steps with Jesus as his Friend knows that in His friendship Jesus must be his Saviour. It is what all find who move any distance through life in the friendship of Jesus. Indeed, before they move one step, while yet Jesus stands before them as a friend, and they steadily look at Him, they see that in His hands are nail prints, on His brow a thorn. A Sufferer! Yet His eyes are not the eyes of a sufferer, but of a conqueror. Conqueror and sufferer, what has He to do with us? And while we look upon our Friend we know that the soul within us has its own struggle, the brute and the spirit strive. We are not good enough, as we are, for His friendship. But in the same moment that we feel this, we feel that to become good enough for His friendship is to find our only true selfhood. Nothing less will do. We want our Friend to stand by us, to refuse to let us sink down to our lower desires, to 'stab our conscience broad awake,' to strengthen the weak will, to understand, to be merciful and never let go of us, to forgive and forgive and forgive. And as we quietly think who we are and what the Holy Father meant us to become we reverently say at length, 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.'¹

¹ R. W. Thompson, *The Friendship of Jesus*, 7.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Road to Jericho.

'And Jesus answering said, A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho.'—Lk 10³⁰.

Some of the most interesting things recorded in the Gospels happened on the highways of Palestine. This is not surprising, for the ministry of our Lord was essentially a ministry of the open road.

A road, from whatever angle you view it, is a romantic thing. It has its value if you consider it even from the standpoint of the engineer or the traveller; but if you think of it from the human standpoint it has a message all its own. For what, after all, is a road? It is a mark of civilization. Humanity, arriving at a certain stage of culture, prepared roads for its feet. Every great roadway in the world is a symbol of a deep-rooted instinct and desire, the desire for communication. The highways are symbols of our yearning to get into touch with one another. We may survey a road, or measure it, or examine its constituents; but a better way is to tread it with imagination, recalling the lives of those who have trodden it before us. So, for example, visitors to Rome who tread the Appian Way may reflect that once the feet of the great Apostle journeyed along there. And what modern pilgrim can make the journey to Jerusalem without a thrill of exultation as he remembers the pilgrims of bygone days?

In one of His great parables Jesus spoke about a journey from Jerusalem to Jericho. There is not much left to-day to suggest the romance and fortunes of the ancient city of Jericho. It was the first city conquered by the Israelites after they had survived the difficulties of the Jordan. Like all ancient cities it had its ups and downs. It saw days of prosperity and peace—there was a college of prophets there in the time of Elisha—and days of adversity. In gospel times it acquired fame through its association with the ministry of our Lord. Round about this place there occurred the encounter with Zacchæus; and the healing of blind Bartimæus. But it lives in our minds because of Jesus' famous parable of the Good Samaritan. 'A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves.'

Why did Jesus refer to that road, if not that He might suggest to us that the road of life is a dangerous road? All who have observed life, as men and women have to live it, have emphasized that aspect. We have, for example, two of the best-known stories in Greek mythology—the Twelve Labours of Hercules, the most celebrated of all the

heroes of Antiquity. And there was the Quest of the Golden Fleece, that story so beloved of our childhood days. Jason, to gain a kingdom, had to secure a golden fleece guarded by a dragon. In our youthful days we revelled in those adventures, but as, with more mature minds, we ask what the Greeks meant by such stories, we come to the conclusion that they regarded the road of achievement as a road of constant striving. In more modern times our greatest allegorist, Bunyan, introduced into his wonderful story the constant difficulties that lie in the Christian's path.

Does not this agree with the explicit declaration of the New Testament? The disciples did not accept the challenge of Jesus because He painted for them a beautiful picture of an easy way. He told them definitely that they were to expect tribulation. And it is still true. Sin is a reality in spite of all our modern attempts to ignore it or explain it away. Deep in our experience we know the power of instincts which lead us away from God. And in the outer world the forces of secularism are still arrayed against us. The modern world does not persecute the followers of Christ as once it did, but, let us make no mistake about it, the power of evil is as big a reality as when Jesus went to His Cross. And we render a great disservice to the cause of true religion if we ignore this fact. The call to discipleship is still a heroic call. It means giving, sacrificing, suffering, for the sake of the Name.

Any one who reads this parable will be impressed by the variety of the travellers on the road. Jesus pictures five types: The wayfarer, the robber, the priest, the Levite, and the compassionate Samaritan. Here, again, is a point in close touch with life as we know it. Our human pathway has its stretches of monotony, but there is no monotony in the characters that plod along it.

Two impressions come to us as we reflect upon this ever-changing scene on the roadway. It is in contact with varied types and conditions of life that we ourselves learn how to live. They supply the conditions of our moral growth. We meet upon the roadway the selfish, the carnally-minded, the arrogant and aggressive, the proud and the scornful; and it is in face of the challenges which these present that we have to live our Christian life. We would not wish it otherwise, for nobody wants to live his Christian life in solitude. If the road is full of men and women whose ideals never rise higher than the pavement, all the more need for us to venture among them with our witness to greater and nobler ideals. But a more arresting

thought still is that, among the varied types which we meet, there is not one for whom the Grace of God will suffice. In our more depressing moments, when the full force of the world's indifference overcomes us, we are apt to cry, 'Who is sufficient for all this human need?' Can our teachers and professors cope with it? Can our legislators guide it? Can our Church organizations deal with it? And we are thrown back upon the only answer: Only God could provide the way of life for all these striving, jostling, shouting men and women. It is the will of God alone that can give peace to the restless soul. It is the Word of God alone that can bring hope to the disheartened. It is the tender sympathy of Christ that will avail for those crushed and beaten back in life's great surge. And that this is no mere theory is proved again and again by the experience of thousands in every age.

And this brings us to the great thought that Christ is on the Road. If we dip into the writings of the great Church Fathers, we find that this road from Jerusalem to Jericho has often been interpreted as a mystical representation of human life. The traveller is our human nature. It has left Jerusalem, the City of God, for Jericho, the profane city. On the journey the human soul meets with dangers. Where can it find help? The priest comes along, representing the Law, but there is no help here. The Levite comes, representing sacrifice, but this does not avail. It is only the Good Samaritan, who is Jesus Himself, who renders help to the needy soul. On this interpretation the way was open for the Fathers of the Church to develop their great message, that what law and sacrifices could not achieve, Jesus achieved. But what we wish to emphasize is that Christ Himself is on the road. He is with us on our journey, and if we will, we may enjoy His comradeship on the way. This was the great truth inherent in all revelation. It was the message of the Old Testament, that we are not to think of God as remote, far away, but as with men. It was surely the inner meaning of the Incarnation—Immanuel, God with us. 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.'

It must have been with a feeling such as this that the disciples set out on their adventure for Christ in those early days of the Church. 'What else matters,' they exclaimed, 'if He be with us?' With that conviction, strong and deep in their lives, they were able to face anything. For wherever the road was leading, it meant a sure comradeship. 'Nothing can separate us from his love,' cried Paul; and if anybody knew, Paul

certainly did. Yes, it is a great experience to walk along with Christ.¹

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Harvest Thanksgiving.

'For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.'—Is 55^{10d}.

When these words were first uttered many of the Jews were in exile and the whole nation was very despondent. Everything seemed to have gone against them, and under the stress of national calamities they had largely lost the saving grace of hope. But there arose in their midst a prophet who still saw the light of God, and with great courage he set himself to stir his fellow-countrymen to a truer conception of life. It was not Jehovah, he declared, but they themselves who had failed. If only they would turn their thoughts and hearts to God, they would inherit those blessings—material and spiritual—which for the nonce they had forfeited.

It is of special interest to us to observe that the prophet sustains this statement—it might be called the gospel of the old dispensation—by an appeal to Nature.

1. *God's Word*.—It is proper for us Christians to interpret God's 'word' as involving the whole Christian dispensation and purpose. St. John describes our Lord as the *Logos*, the very utterance of God. What does Jesus express? Surely that God is love, and that therefore it is His will and promise to deliver us from the thralldom of sin, and to bless us with fullness of life and happiness. Salvation! That is God's word to men.

The promise of deliverance and bliss was made through Isaiah to the whole Jewish people, and the Christian development of that promise has undoubtedly a national application. God has laws for nations as for Nature; and although the precise form of their application may be ambiguous here and there, there can be no doubt as to their general principles. We know it is God's will and rule that nations should esteem righteousness more than mammon, and fellowship more than moloch. He has given us statutes and ordinances to observe and to do. It is well for statesmen to

¹ F. Townley Lord, *Christ on the Road*, 11.

study them. The art of government ultimately depends upon their observance. The setting aside of those eternal principles enunciated by Jehovah to the Jews of old can lead only to disaster. History supplies too many melancholy illustrations for any one to doubt that. On the other hand, righteousness does indeed exalt a nation, and blessings inestimable abound where God's broad principles are made the foundation of national life. The 'word' is effective, and prospers in the thing whereto it is sent.

Likewise with individual men and women. God's 'word' uttered in the gospel and expounded in the Church is designed to save imperishable personalities from sin and shame, and to bring them true enduring life. In this, as in its national mission, it returneth not void, but attains its end and really achieves. Observation and experience bear unshakeable witness to the power of the 'word' to make good. Wherever the gospel of Christ has been given free course, wherever men have faithfully endeavoured to cultivate its spirit and to live by its principles, it has borne a harvest of inestimable worth. But such results can be reaped only where certain conditions are fulfilled. What are those conditions? The splendid sacraments of the processes of Nature to which the prophet so aptly refers will help us to find the answer.

2. *Man's Co-operation.*—The rain and the snow do not themselves fructify. They water the earth; but the earth has an indispensable share in the process of growth. There are precious elements in the rain and snow which left to themselves would be sterile; but, in contact with certain chemical properties in the soil, they bear fruit. Wherever the subject of attainment is dealt with in the Bible, and notably in the Parable of the Sower, this necessity of co-operation is plainly set forth. The prophet did not tell the Jews that Jehovah would deliver them by irresistible omnipotence or by the subtler methods of magic. The people themselves must deliberately seek and call upon the Lord. Nay, more, they must repent of their evil ways, forsake them utterly, and turn again to the Lord their God, to work in union with Him. Then, and not till then, could God's 'word' prosper and bear its rich fruit.

The same Divine principle is operative to-day, and has become even more obvious and convincing through the light that is thrown upon it by the science of psychology. Evidence has accumulated that we ourselves have a share in generating every experience. We have an essential share in

the fulfilment of God's purpose in the world. Recognizing this fact, we shall desist from merely sentimental longings and cease to waste time in helpless complaint that there is so much evil in the world; we should realize that God is just waiting for us to work with Him in the increase of those qualities that are essential to the blessing we long to attain.

Safed the Sage, the Rev. William E. Barton, in his *My Faith in Immortality* tells the following story. 'In a recent exhibition a little company gathered about a man who took from his vest-pocket a little box which contained a miniature steam engine. Its base was the size of a three-penny piece, and its boiler contained a dozen drops of water, more or less; but he lighted the tiny alcohol lamp, the water boiled, and the microscopic engine worked. He set it down on the base of the great engine that operated all the machinery of the Exhibition, and the two ran side by side. The machinery of man is too clumsy for such an engine to share the labour of operating the Exhibition. But with God it is not so. It is permitted me to run a tiny thread to the great band-wheel of the universe, and yoke my energy with God's. It is not much, to be sure; and the few drops of alcohol in my lamp are burning fast; but I am not merely a part of the machinery that is being run; I am a part of the power that operates and controls. This is the end for which life was made. This is a part of the structural plan of the universe. This is the destination towards which we journey.'

3. *Patience.*—We all ask ourselves sometimes. Why does so beneficent a purpose as God's tarry so long? Why does the 'word' not prosper more swiftly? Well, it is not just a question of God's will or power. We have observed that His unalterable way is to work with and through men. Progress is a co-operative movement. Let us confess that God is having to work with poor partners. The problem is complicated because progress involves the uplifting of frail and imperfect men. Their own deliberate assent is essential, otherwise how would they be saved? And let us remember this: apart from the saving of men, there can be no saving of the world. But it must not be thought that because there is no startling advance there is no improvement. Here again, God teaches through Nature. We have occasionally seen the snow lie thick upon the ground and in that state it seems merely obstructive; but a few months later we may see a crop of golden wheat where that snow lay, and

he snow has helped to produce it. Or we see torrents of rain fall upon a bare mountain where it appears to be sheer waste; but down below in the valley that very water turns the mill that grinds the corn and quenches the thirst of a thousand oxen. Let us learn to give God time to work out His sovereign will.

Dr. Gossip writes: 'To attempt to measure what God's grace can do through our poor efforts is the maddest folly. Is it so small a thing to bend and tinge and make even one of those little minds, though all the rest remain impervious to all your efforts all the years? "I can't realize that I should ever be so honoured of God," writes Smetham; "I can go on working, I can sow a little, I can add my labour to the heap, in hope that among other agencies I may help rather than retard. But to save a soul as the direct result of my personal effort!" And yet that august possibility lies open to us all. And we can never tell. . . . Didn't a certain Black Friar one day open his heart to a youth? He is forgotten, and yet he made Scotland. For his words gripped, haunted, laid compulsion on John Knox! And didn't a disappointed man in an Argyleshire glen, with nothing to encourage him, keep on teaching his dwindling class year in, year out? And have not the ends of the earth good cause to honour him because one day one little lad, as he sat there and listened, made up his mind to be what he became, James Chalmers of New Guinea, whom Stevenson so envied?'¹

¹ *The Hero in thy Soul*, 89.

4. *Assured victory*.—To-day, as in Isaiah's time; one of the greatest needs is the rekindling of hope and faith in the hearts of men. God's 'word' cannot but prosper and bring blessings where it is given free course. This is as plainly attested in history as it is asserted in the Bible. And in this generation do we not see glimpses of the Divine process? Whatever disappointments we still experience, there are signs that the general trend of the world is towards the eternal goal of God. We would interpret as a parable the fact that the rain and the snow come from above, from the heavens. The gospel of salvation must prosper because it comes from God who is All-Sovereign as well as All-Good. Despite some happenings that suggest the contrary, we believe that God is in command of all the forces in the universe, that He is supreme. It is well for us to renew our faith in His power from time to time. When the eyes of Elisha's servant were opened he saw the mountain ablaze with horses and chariots of fire. God grant us in time of doubt and perplexity the reassurance of such a vision.²

If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars;
It may be, in yon smoke concealed,
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,
And, but for you, possess the field.

For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes, silent, flooding in, the main.

² R. E. Roberts, *The Hope of the World*, 105.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTSHIRE.

PROFESSOR ELIHU GRANT has afforded us further information regarding discoveries at *Rumeileh*, southern Beth-shemesh (Jos 15¹⁰, 1 S 6⁹, 2 Ch 28¹⁸, etc.), about twenty miles due west of Jerusalem, at the edge of the Shephelah or lower hill country. It was here that Amaziah of Judah was defeated and made prisoner by Jehoash, king of Israel, and the city must have figured largely in ancient history. 'The main results,' Professor Grant says, 'are naturally confirmatory of our knowledge of southern Canaan during the two millennia just preceding the Christian era.' Excavations show

that the people had an unusual predilection for beauty, colour, and foreign artistic achievement. They imported numerous *objets d'art* as well as useful articles, including alabaster, bronzes, gems, jewellery, scarabs, seals, and weapons. Ægean and Egyptian influences were prominent, perhaps also Babylonian, while North Syrian were only faintly seen. Hebron was the dominating centre rather than Jerusalem. The religious ideas were broad and mature, with numerous varied symbols, not only Palestinian, but Mycænean, Minoan, and Egyptian. The place was the City of the Sun (cf.

Mt. Heres, 'Mount of the Sun,' Jg 1³⁵), and was the centre of the worship and benefactions of Astarte, the mother goddess of fertility, of whom numerous figurines, plaques, and emblems (dove and gazelle) have been found in the site. So far the excavators have discovered no evidence of the fiercer aspects of this worship, but much suggestion of what Professor Grant calls 'the eclectic and the humane.' Wine, oil, grain, barter, dignity, officialdom, travel, news, compromise, are the notes we hear. Although there have been seven separate seasons of work at the hill (first explored in 1911), and three Bronze Age cemeteries have been opened, yielding one of the largest known treasures of Canaanite burial deposits, about half of the hill remains to be excavated, and it is believed there are still more important burial-grounds that lie hidden.

At *Tell Duweir*, believed to be the Biblical Lachish, Mr. J. L. Starkey, the director of the expedition there, has already managed to lay bare much of the vanished city. Inside the lower fortifications he found a shaft filled with débris, and when this was cleared, a well nearly two hundred and fifty feet deep was disclosed, containing eighteen feet of excellent water, and dating apparently from very early times, probably from the Hyksos age. On the left-hand side of the gateway, his workmen came on one of the idolatrous shrines—the first of the kind found in Palestine—which were erected at city entrances in Israelitic times, and most of which were broken down by Josiah (2 K 23⁸). Another interesting discovery was the metal crest of a soldier's helmet, which corresponds exactly to the crests on the peculiar-shaped helmets worn by Sennacherib's soldiers, as generally depicted. This seems to corroborate the identification of *Tell Duweir* with Lachish, for this city was besieged and plundered by Sennacherib (2 K 18^{13, 14}, 2 Ch 32⁹, Is 36¹, etc.) about 700 B.C., when he swept through Judah, capturing forty-six fortresses and carrying over two hundred thousand Jews into exile. Mr. Starkey has found signs of the breaching of the walls when this Assyrian monarch besieged the city. There is abundant evidence, too, of the destruction that was caused over a century later (c. 586 B.C.) by Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon (Jer 35⁷), who appears to have cut down the whole of the olive, fig, and oak trees that covered the neighbouring hills and to have piled them against the walls, using them as combustible material there, and thus causing the walls to disintegrate and collapse through the great heat engendered by the conflagration. Mr. Starkey hopes soon to come upon the defences of the earlier

Lachish that was captured by Joshua (Jos 10¹¹). Already he has struck the red brick walls of this previous occupation.

Fuller accounts have now been issued by Professor O. R. Sellars of Chicago in regard to the excavations at the Biblical Beth-zur (cf. Jos 15⁵⁸, 1 S 30²⁷, 1 Ch 24⁵, etc.), now *Khirbet Tubeiqā*, 'the house of the mountain-god,' about five miles north of Hebron. The site is on a conical hill, commanding the old Jerusalem road. One interesting discovery has been a large reservoir, different from the ordinary cistern. It has three layers of broken plaster on the walls and a flight of twenty-six steps (with a balustrade) leading down to the floor. The workmen found bones of many animals in it: dogs, rats, cows, camels, goats, and donkeys. In one corner there were a few human bones and a skull—perhaps a hasty secret burial to conceal foul play. The excavators unearthed an abundance of sherds belonging to the Early Iron Age (1200–600 B.C.), but what is noteworthy is that there is a distinct break between these and the Hellenistic ones. There are no transitional types at all, and thus there seems little doubt that the city was depopulated and probably burned about the time of Nebuchadnezzar's invasion and remained uninhabited until the end of the sixth century or the beginning of the fifth. This seems to add to some evidence in support of the Biblical statement of the Exile and the subsequent return.

Sir Flinders Petrie, in his recent work at Old Gaza (*Tell Ajjûl*), has brought to light numerous weapons and other articles, ranging from 3100 to 1500 B.C., including bronze knives and daggers, bronze plates from scale armour, spindle whorls, dice, knuckle-bones, gold ornaments, crescent armlets, toggle-pins for fastening the dress, earrings, and head-bands. One of the daggers though five thousand or more years old, has beautifully hand-worked raised veins running down the blade; and as this peculiar characteristic corresponds to decorations coming from the Caspian regions, it affords evidence, he believes, that the Egyptians of the seventh and eighth dynasties (c. 2500 B.C.)—one of the six races to conquer Egypt—came from that distant quarter. This may be true, as the natural features referred to in the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* seem to be identical with those of the Caucasus Isthmus, and the relationship between the Egyptians and the Caucasus race has further been proved on ethnological grounds and from examinations of a large number of Egyptian skulls and mummies. Judging from the palace of these foreigners in Gaza, with its

luxurious bathroom, and the other buildings, they must have been a powerful and hardy race. Sir Flinders, despite his eighty years, is returning to the site in the early autumn.

The extraordinary discoveries being made at Ras Shamra (the Egyptian Ugarit) by Schaeffer and Chenet are revolutionizing our Biblical knowledge. Many of the alphabetical texts, composed, no doubt, between 1700 and 1500 B.C., are written in a non-Semitic language, which Hrozný has conclusively proved to be Horite (Hurrite or Hurrian). The tablets bear repeated references to the chief god of the Horites, Kumarve, 'father of the gods'; and one large one recently translated by Thureau-Dangin, the great French Assyriologist, contains a trilingual vocabulary of legal and business terms in Sumerian, Accadian, and Horite. Until recently most Biblical scholars have regarded the Horites, a little known Biblical people (Gn 14⁶ 36²⁰ⁿ, Dt 2^{12, 23}, etc.) as a legendary race of cave-dwellers or 'Troglydites' in southern Palestine, instead of being one of the most important cultural races of Western Asia during the earlier part of the second millennium. They belonged to the Subaræan linguistic stock, and, some time before the Semites arrived on the scene, they occupied the whole of northern Mesopotamia, which they called 'Subir' (or in Arcadian, 'Subartu'). They are mentioned not only in these Ugarit tablets, but in documents from Boghaz-keui, Qatna (*el-Mishrifeh*), Nuzi (near *Kirkûk*), Taanach, Shechem, and other places. It was to the Hurrians that the Hittites directly owed their civilization, including their religion and most of their literature; and it was to them also that the kingdom of Mitanni, extending in the fifteenth century B.C. from the Zagros Mountains to the Mediterranean, and ruled by an Indo-Iranian nobility, was indebted for its language and culture. This Hurrian stock must have exerted a considerable influence on the Hebrews, and they have left their name not only in the Biblical 'Horite' but in *Kharu*, an Egyptian name for Palestine mentioned on Merenptah's Victory stele and elsewhere. It is almost certain that further excavations at Ras Shamra (only an insignificant part of the site has so far been examined) will yield much information of importance regarding this ancient race, who were in the country of Seir as early as the time of Abraham (Gn 14⁶).

Hieroglyphic experts, such as Forrer, Bossert, Hrozný, and Meriggi, are now coming much nearer to a solution of the ancient 'Hittite' inscriptions, which are spread over the region to the north and south of the eastern Taurus, and are believed to

contain most important historical information relating to the second millennium B.C. Their decipherment, which has baffled scholars for fifty years, would no doubt throw considerable light on the races and history of Palestine. Since the discovery of the Boghaz-keui texts, and particularly within the last year, the experts referred to have made remarkable advances in the matter. They first succeeded in transliterating several proper names, especially those of gods, towns, and men. By this means they were able to determine a large number of signs, of which Meriggi enumerates thirty-eight, apart from determinatives. This again led to the interpretation of various common nouns and verbs, and now Forrer and Meriggi have announced the translation of a certain number of phrases. The language is not the classic Hittite, but is believed to be that of the people (Gasgas, Mushki, Tabal) who overturned the great Hittite empire about 1200 B.C., and who lived and ruled around the higher sources of the Euphrates. There is no longer any doubt that the ancient races who inhabited the Euphrates Valley, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, possessed a much higher culture than most critics have imagined. Discoveries are proving that the alphabetic script was known before the days of Moses, and that cuneiform and other writing was in general use on tablets and monuments long before the time of Abraham (c. 2090 B.C.). Perhaps one of the most interesting discoveries in Jericho has been that of a small clay cuneiform tablet—about two inches square—in the Royal palace. The tablet has been blackened by the great fire at the taking of the city by Joshua, and has suffered damage by the falling débris, but it shows three lines of cuneiform writing, of the same type as that occurring on the el-Amarna Tablets (c. 1380 B.C.). Unfortunately, the second line has been obliterated, and only two characters in the third can be deciphered. It would be interesting to have further light thrown upon it by cuneiform scholars. It is believed by some to be in the Babylonian language, or perhaps in some dialect of North Syria, but we would suggest that it may be found to be in a form of Amorite fused with Canaanite.

The recent reports by Mr. Howard Carter as to the contents of Tut-ankh-amen's tomb (c. 1360 B.C.) throw an interesting light on many Biblical matters. We have referred to the early practice of writing. In the tomb has been found a complete writing outfit, consisting of a reed-holder with a number of fine reeds (cf. Ps 45¹, where the LXX has *κάλamos γραμματέως*), together with two palettes (containing red and black colours), one of which is plated with gold and the other is solid ivory. There is little

doubt that the Israelites (and especially their leaders) who left Egypt at the Exodus were well acquainted with such writing materials, and their scribes must have made use of similar outfits. Another interesting discovery in the tomb is a 'lighter' or apparatus for creating fire. Neither the Hebrews nor the Egyptians knew anything of the combustible materials like phosphorus and sulphur, which easily take fire when rubbed on any rough surface, nor did they know of agents such as flint and iron with tinder. Their 'lighter' was of a very primitive nature. They created fire by rapidly rotating a piece of stick in a round hole in a stationary piece of wood. For the rotation they applied the principle of the bow-drill with which they were familiar. The holes (for there were generally several) were made at the edge of the wood, so that the spark could have free access to the tinder. In some 'lighters' the holes were treated with resin to promote friction, and thus facilitate the creation of heat. Among other 'finds' in the tomb are two slings, with a few smooth stones beside them, reminding us forcibly of David and Goliath. The sling was a common weapon in warfare from barbaric times downward (cf. 2 K 3²⁵, 1 Mac 6⁵¹). The Benjamite left-handed slingers were famous (Jg 20¹⁶, 1 Ch 12²). Here in Tut-ankh-amen's chest of the fourteenth century B.C. the slings are of plaited linen thread, each neatly made with a pouch, and a loop at the

end of one of its chords to hold it firmly on the little finger, while the second chord is left quite plain for loosening between the thumb and first finger when dispatching the missile. This form of sling is similar to those depicted on the Assyrian reliefs and would doubtless be the kind that young David used against the Philistine giant.

Palestine has now become one of the main centres of research in prehistoric archæology. In an expedition which has recently been made through the desert of eastern Transjordan, led by Mr. George Horsfield, Director of Antiquities there, and Dr. Nelson Glueck of the American School, Jerusalem, some remarkable prehistoric rock-drawings have been discovered at Kilwa (in the *Jebel Tubaig*), not unlike those in the cave at *Um Qatafa*, several miles from Bethlehem. They occur on the side and top of a hard sandstone hill, and consist of carved figures of animals, mostly of the ibex type. They have been sketched at all angles and superimposed one upon another in bewildering confusion. The lines are sharp and clear, and the flint chisel marks are still quite visible. It is evident that in palæolithic times, probably as far back as 12,000 B.C., there were people living round about Kilwa and they have immortalized their stay with these ineffaceable records, similar to what we find on numerous prehistoric sites in Europe and Africa.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Early Asceticism and Monasticism.¹

ANOTHER of the admirable source-books for which students are indebted to this firm. Professor Koch and his publishers deserve real gratitude from all who would go below the surface of early Church history and investigate at first-hand the rise and variations of the phenomena which mark asceticism and the monasticism which was its chief sequel. In this textbook we have extracts in Greek and Latin, with brief textual and bibliographical notes, to illustrate first of all (i) the characteristic phases of primitive asceticism, and then (ii) the salient

features of the monastic development as it took shape in the East and in the West. In (i) the Eastern series, the selections begin with quotation from the *Didaché* and Ignatius, and the climax is a passage from Chrysostom's *De Virginitate*. It is one serviceable feature of the textbook that the editor includes data about the organization of the ascetic principle, both here and in dealing with the Western form (p. 62 f.), which starts with Clement of Rome and ends with citations from Jerome's epistles. In (ii) the survey of monasticism, the Eastern branch is treated geographically, in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, then in Rome and Constantinople. Similarly the Western movement is followed first in Italy, then in Africa, and finally in Spain and Gaul, with two closing extracts upon Benedictine monachism. The choice of passages is happy; the

¹ *Quellen zur Geschichte der Askese und des Mönchtums in der alten Kirche*, herausgegeben von Professor Dr. Hugo Koch (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; 1933; M. 5.80).

arrangement is lucid; and the general effect is a true reflection of the subjects, such as one might expect from a masterhand like that of Professor Koch. It might have been useful to print a section, however, containing definite criticisms of the movement, from serious opponents. No doubt some of the selections bring out the other side, as, for example, those numbered 93 and 103, but these are isolated, and the similar passages from the Didascalia are too minor to suggest the full weight of the opposition. Otherwise, the pages of this textbook supply a long-felt want. They are a capital aid to any thorough study of the subjects at first-hand.

Nineteen introductory selections exhibit the idea of asceticism as a pre-Christian and extra-Christian force. These are rather scrappy, starting with a single sentence from Empedocles, two passages from the Phædo, and including data about the Serapiscult in Egypt, the Neoplatonists, and the phenomena of the Essenes and the Therapeutæ. Still, they serve to set the Christian movement in its pagan and Jewish context, and they will prevent the student from supposing that the Church's use of the principle, for all its idiosyncrasies, was an isolated phenomenon in the early centuries.

Considerations of space have obliged the editor to confine his survey to the Greek and Roman world, and even so he has obviously had to leave out material. He rightly supposes that the Rule of Benedict, for instance, is already accessible to the student elsewhere. On the other hand, it is specially serviceable to have so many decisions of synods and councils collected, and to be provided not only with the extracts from pseudo-Dionysius, but with Jerome's translation of the Rule of Pachomius.

The book is elaborately indexed, even to the extent of noting the Greek and Latin terms employed in the vocabulary of the two movements. This adds materially to its value for the student of the texts; indeed, it is almost as praiseworthy as the traces of evident care spent upon the text. On p. 45 (line 16) read 'aequum'; the commas are wrong on p. 53 (lines 35, 36); on p. 56 (line 12) for 49 read 42; on p. 61 (line 8) read 'Marriott.'

The bibliographies are a model of sound work, but since they are naturally intended for German students, English readers will require to supplement them at several points. Thus—to give only a few instances—the opening sentence from Empedocles should be read in the light of Capelle's article in *THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* (ii. 81 f.), a work to which, so far as I see, Professor Koch does not refer at all. Augustine's *Epistula* (ccxi.) can be studied in Professor Baxter's Loeb

selection of the saint's correspondence; there are English versions now of Pourrat's *La Spiritualité Chrétienne* as well as of Harnack's *Das Mönchthum* and Troeltsch's *Soziallehren*, and the literature on p. 32 should include Mr. Metcalfe's version (S.P.C.K.). The phenomena of Egyptian monasticism are illuminated by data collected in Mr. H. G. Evelyn White's handsome volumes (i. 1926, ii. 1932) on *The Monasteries of the Wadi'n Natrun*, and the monastic treatises cited on p. xii should include Butler's survey of Monasticism in the first volume of the *Cambridge Mediæval History* and I. Gregory Smith's *Christian Monasticism* (1892), just as Dr. Lowther Clarke's translation of *The Ascetic Works of St. Basil* (S.P.C.K.) falls to be inserted on p. 145. For the seventh book of Clement's *Stromateis* (p. 28 f.), the best edition in any language is Hort and Mayor's. On the general topic of monastic asceticism and the clerical vocation, consult further the fourth chapter of Wordsworth's *Ministry of Grace* (1901); for the Council of Elvira, A. W. W. Dale's treatise, which has not yet been superseded; and for the subject handled on p. 163 f., the admirable sketch by Dr. Scott Holmes in *The Origin and Development of the Christian Church in Gaul* (1911). I would add, further, that for students other than German the 'neueste Uebersetzung' of the Wars of Josephus (p. 196) is either Mr. Thackeray's, in the Loeb series, or the French work, now completed (Leroux, Paris), by René Harmand and Théodore Reinach; on p. xi the student should consult A. L. Schmitz's article in *Röm. Quartalschrift* (xxxvii. 189 f.); the ascetic ideas of Porphyry and the later Neoplatonists are discussed by Geffcken in his *Ausgang des Griechisch-Römischen Heidenthum*, (pp. 70 f., 197 f.), and Tertullian's by D'Alès in *La Théologie de Tertullien* (p. 295 f.).

The Sacred Rock.¹

IN his fascinating volume, *Tent and Testament* (1907), a book too little known, but full of vivid comments upon the Bible, Mr. Herbert Rix describes the thrill which he felt on reaching the sacred Rock in Jerusalem with its oratory or Dome for private devotion, consecrated not only by Islamic associations, but by the earlier traditions of the Jewish temple-worship. 'I confess that it was with deep emotion that I approached this venerable rock. . . . I began to get an inkling of what the Prophet

¹ *Der Heilige Fels in Jerusalem*, by Hans Schmidt (Mohr, Tübingen, 1933; M.4.50).

meant by his "night-journey to heaven" when he knelt upon this rock. This fascination was due to my firm conviction (and subsequent study has not shaken it), that this was the actual spot upon which stood the altar of burnt-offering in the Temple of Solomon, in the Temple of Zerubbabel, and in the Temple of Herod. . . . And it was upon this same spot that His eyes too were fixed at the hour of sacrifice when He came up to His "Father's House," a lad of twelve, and when in after-years He attended the feasts with His friends or His disciples' (p. 229 f., see p. 304). But study had and has led others to a different conclusion. Only two years later Colonel Conder, in *The City of Jerusalem* (pp. 55 f., 124 f.), reiterated his conviction that the sacred Rock represented the stone of foundation within the Holy of Holies. That is, he adhered to the Jewish tradition, dating from the Mishna, that instead of being the unhewn rock facing the Holy Place, it is to be identified with the stone or rock of foundation itself, which marked the centre and site of the Sacred Place. Professor Schmidt has not seen Colonel Conder's work, he admits (p. 39), but from personal investigation he is convinced that this is the correct view, and he has written a monograph to prove his case. It is, of course, a well-known problem of archæology, in which the balance of opinion recently has been in favour of the view that the Rock corresponds to the site of the altar of burnt-offering. The arguments are partly based on measurements, partly on the interpretation of literary references in Josephus and the Mishna. Into all these details Professor Schmidt enters with full attention. Maps and illustrations supplement the arguments of the text. The result is an exceptionally keen statement of the theory, or, it would be more accurate to say, the tradition, as against the dominant view. Whether or not the author will carry conviction among archæological experts, remains to be seen. He admits that when he put his case before Dr. Gressmann and Professor Dalman, both scholars demurred to his ideas. Still, even readers who may not feel disposed to shift their allegiance, will learn much from the chapters upon the prestige of the Rock in the Bible (pp. 17 f., 40 f., 78 f.), notably in connexion with passages like 2 S 24¹¹, Ps 99⁹, and Is 28^{14f.}. These pages justify the sub-title of the monograph as 'eine archæologische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie,' although the last twenty-four (pp. 78-102) run directly counter to the thesis which is acutely argued in Dr. H. W. Hertzberg's article upon 'Der heilige Fels und das Alte Testament' in *The Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* (xii. [1932] 32-42).

Christianity and Civilization.¹

IN this lucid and independent lecture, delivered at the University of Helsingfors last September, Professor von Soden handles a subject on which most of us have listened to great argument from sage and saint, and on which, as the lecturer admits, his fellow-countryman Spengler has spoken gravely, although 'in highly arbitrary categories.' Taking 'Kultur' to mean man's realization of the possibilities of mental and moral life on the basis of his inheritance in the natural order, he outlines, first of all, the historical relations between faith on the one hand, and the complex of art, science, and the economic or social order upon the other, beginning with the primitive phase in which the Church has no political or social programme at all, passing on to the Gnostic controversy in which, he points out, 'the apologists and early catholic fathers were influenced particularly by a sense of responsibility for civilization' (p. 15), and then discussing the recognition of a Divine sanction within the natural order, adumbrated by Augustine in his *City of God* (p. 20 f.). The mediæval synthesis is then outlined, on familiar lines, concluding with an estimate of Luther's attitude and the development in later Christianity. The author pleads for genuine 'liberalism' ('I am not ashamed to use a term which is despised nowadays in Germany in the universities, and insists that Christianity, breathing a spirit of free inquiry, is never antithetical to social, though it is critical of the forms of civilization. There have been, he protests, as serious crises as the present; any student of history knows that (p. 41). It is no discredit to the faith that tragic happenings overtake mankind. Christianity as real religion has simply two things to say to contemporary civilization. One is, that the Christian neither glorifies nor blackens it, and the other is that Christians still are 'the salt of the earth.' This is certainly frank, but not more frank than his claim at the end of the essay, that in Germany there is an incomparable opportunity nowadays of testing the fundamental question whether it is the Roman Catholic or the Protestant application of 'the salt of the earth' theory which is correct, since Germany, though outsiders do not always recognize this, exhibits an inner Protestantism within the Roman pale and a catholic

¹ *Christentum und Kultur in der geschichtlichen Entwicklung ihrer Beziehungen*, by Professor Hans von Soden of Marburg (Mohr, Tübingen, 1933: No. 165; the 'Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge M.1.50).

wardness within the Protestant. And how will he test go? Well, Professor von Soden is, at any rate, not unhopeful about the prospects. His address ends on a note of cautious, resolute courage, which is all to the good.

Old Testament student will find useful discussions of passages like 2 S 15⁷ and Mal 1¹¹.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

Varia.

Fission and Fusion in Godland.¹

As this very suggestive lecture was delivered to a society of Egyptian archaeologists in Berlin, it has a special number of allusions to the cults of ancient Egypt, but the theme is broader than any one religion of the ancient world, and Professor Bertholet's range of knowledge enables him to illuminate his thesis with data from various cults, from Hebrew religion to Chinese Buddhism. On one side, as he shows, deities become divided; there are local differentiations of a single god. The Canaanite Baal appears in a variety of forms, like the Istar of the Babylonians and the Juno of the Romans. A deity becomes also split into a male and a female manifestation; the Rig-Veda pantheon furnishes rich evidence of this. Partly this is due to the desire of finding a god in closer touch with man than the original conception of the deity suggested (p. 12 f.). On the other hand, there is a movement in the direction of fusing ideas of deity into one, at certain epochs, as is well known to have been the case in all syncretistic tendencies. The Hebrew Yahweh is identified or collated with the Canaanite Baal, Zeus with Helios, and Apollo with Asclepius. Sometimes this occurs when a local or national deity is taken up into the cult of a nature-god (p. 17 f.); political exigencies may determine a combination of the two.

The limits of the lecture do not permit much analysis of the factors which enter into these curious movements in religious thought and ritual, though Professor Bertholet shows himself well aware of the problems. It would have been helpful to have had the historical and philosophical implications worked out, especially in connexion with the recurring tendency to syncretism. But, as it is, the pages of this monograph lay bare a fascinating issue within comparative religion; they draw together material from a wide field, converging on the dual tendency to split up a deity into several deities, and to fuse a number of deities into a single god. The

A USEFUL volume for the study of the prophets² has been written by J. Chaine, who has appended to it a map and some photographs taken during a recent residence in Palestine. His object was 'to write a simple guide which endeavours to place the writings of the prophets in the historical environment for which they were composed.' In this he has been eminently successful, as is shown not only by his introductory and concluding chapters on 'The Jewish people from the schism of the twelve tribes up to the time of Amos and Hosea' and 'The Hellenization of the Orient' respectively, but by the adroitness with which he has woven the history into the messages of the prophets, and by his treatment within the same chapter of contemporary passages from the hands of different prophets; for example, Isaiah and Micah, and of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

On critical questions the writer expresses himself cautiously. While admitting that the book discovered in 621 B.C. was Deuteronomy in whole or in part, he is inclined to claim Is 14 and 19¹⁸⁻²⁵ for Isaiah. He regards Is 2²⁻⁵ as an interpolation from Mic 4¹⁻⁵, a passage which he ascribes to Micah himself. The Book of Daniel, as we now have it, represents an older text retouched in Maccabean times by an 'inspired redactor.' He makes the suggestion that Ahaz's sacrifice of his son (2 K 16³) was connected with the Syro-Ephraimite menace in 735 B.C. Naturally he regards the prophetic passages which seem to attack the cult as attacks only upon the formalism encouraged by it. How deep is the cleft between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic approach to the Bible is evidenced by the introduction to his discussion of Deutero-Isaiah. While admitting the difficulties of Isaianic authorship, he goes on: 'The Biblical Commission in its decree of June 1908 has declared that there is no sufficient reason for rejecting the unity of authorship'—i.e. with the earlier Isaiah—'and that Isaiah speaks to the captives and comforts them as if he was living among them. It is precisely because Isaiah expresses himself as if he were living in Babylon that we have deferred the exposition of his message till

¹ *Göttespaltung und Göttervereinigung*, by Professor Alfred Bertholet (Mohr, Tübingen, 1933: No. 164 in 'Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge'; M. 1.50).

² *Introduction à la Lecture des Prophètes*, par J. Chaine (Librairie Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte 90, Paris; pp. 274; 20 fr.).

now'—when he is discussing Cyrus and the Exile. When he further says, 'The best way to understand the chapters devoted to the exiles is to study them in the historical and psychological environment for which they were written,' a Protestant scholar may be excused for believing that, if Chaine were free to speak his mind, he would claim an exilic origin for these chapters.

Students of the family and of marriage will find an abundance of material in the proceedings of the Congress held at Luxembourg¹ from 16th to 22nd September 1929. One of the objects of the Congress was to secure the revision of current opinions on sociological questions. All the contributions are in French or German, with the exception of one which is in Italian. There are papers on Comparative Religion, Religious Psychopathology, The Irrational in the Religious Life, Flemish Folk-Lore, etc.; but the bulk of the discussion was devoted to the Family. There are papers on The Family among Primitive Peoples, in Japan and Korea, in Islam, in the Congo, among the Bushmen, among the Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians, and Hittites, in South Africa and many other parts of the world. Marriage and marriage customs in Luxembourg, in Dutch folk-lore, and among the Aztecs, etc.; exogamy, social and religious evolution, the relation of religion to the family—these and many cognate questions are discussed with the fulness and the accuracy which we have a right to expect from experts. It is impossible in a brief notice to give any idea of the richness of a volume whose contents are so varied; suffice it to say that the discussions were entrusted to specialists, the usages of primitive peoples, for example, being presented by missionaries who were thoroughly familiar with them through a long residence in the country.

To the German Roman Catholic Commentary on the Bible two additions, together constituting the

¹ *Internationale Woche für Religions-Ethnologie* (Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, Paris; pp. 367; 57.50 fr.).

seventh volume, have recently been made—the commentary on Lamentations by Dr. Tharsiclus Paffrath and that on Baruch by Dr. Edmund Kalt. Both are scholarly and both are conservative in their temper and conclusions. After dealing with the acrostic form of La 1-4, which Paffrath argues forms no obstacle to the Jeremianic authorship, he discusses in detail the other objections to the authorship based upon the attitude to Zedekiah in 4²⁰ and to Egypt in 4¹⁷, the reference to the prophets in 2⁹, etc. He argues that in the two former cases Jeremiah is speaking in the name of the people, and that none of them is essentially incompatible with the LXX tradition which assigns the book to Jeremiah. In 3²² he prefers the traditional *חַסְדֵי יְהוָה* ('It is of Jahweh's mercies that we are not consumed') to *חַסְדֵי*, which is supported by some of the versions and which yields a much better parallelism ('J's mercies cease not, His compassion fail not').

Kalt, while admitting that the Book of Baruch falls into two distinct parts, 1¹-3⁸ and 3⁹-5⁹, and that the second strikes a different note, yet argues that the whole book is from the pen of Baruch and defends it against the attacks upon its authenticity based on its alleged historical inaccuracies and its apparent knowledge of late Wisdom literature and even of Alexandrian ideas. The argument that its authenticity is strongly supported by 'the astonishing familiarity of the author with the book and the language of Jeremiah' will carry little conviction to one who remembers how well acquainted later writers were with older scriptures. To the Book of Baruch is appended the 'Epistle of Jeremiah,' which Kalt assigns to the period before the Fall of the Babylonian empire.

All three books are provided with a translation and an adequate commentary, whose aim is to emphasize religious values rather than textual difficulties.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Trinity College, Glasgow.

² *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, Bd. vi (Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, Bonn; gek. Mk.3.40, geb. Mk.4.70).

Contributions and Comments.

'Turned the World upside down.'

LOOKING over the Urdu translation of the New Testament, recently reprinted, one is struck with

the fact that this picturesque but misleading translation of *ἀναταράσσωντες* in Ac 17⁶ has not been amended in R.V. As is well known, this is a Greek O.T. word, meaning to stir up, excite, or unsettle

Of the three occurrences in the N.T.; in Gal 5¹² it is rendered *unsettle*, with reference to matters of faith; in Ac 21³⁸ the chiliarch in charge of St. Paul in the castle at Jerusalem supposes that it is he who had *stirred up to sedition* a body of assassins; and a similar reference is made in the charge against St. Paul's companions before the politarchs at Thessalonica: 'These men who have *stirred up sedition* throughout the empire (*οἰκουμένη*) . . . act contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus.' In both cases the pith and point of the phrase is the damning charge of disloyalty to the Roman Emperor. Why not the same rendering in both cases? 'Turned the world upside down' has inspired much homiletical eloquence, but it deflects the thought of sedition to that of general radicalism, and it misses the link of continuity between the attitude of the Jews before Pilate: 'We have no king but Cæsar'; and of those in Thessalonica: 'These all act contrary to the decrees of Cæsar.'

In the Urdu version the translation in both these passages is 'bāghī karnā = to make seditions. I suppose other overseas versions will have done the same. The missionary in some cases still has to defend the gospel against the charge of sedition or unpatriotism.

H. U. WEITBRECHT STANTON.

London.

Interpretation of Persian Words.

WHILE examining some time ago the Yemenite manuscript of Mo'ed Kaṭon,¹ which, through the generosity of the Hon. Oscar Straus, has been presented to Columbia University, and which I have been obliged to describe elsewhere² on several occasions, I happened to have come across in several of the marginal glosses, supposedly Persian words, the meaning of which I have been unable to find either in Steingass, *Persian-English Dictionary*, or in any of the other handbooks, dealing with the Persian language.

The following etymologies, however, might be conjectured:

¹ I edited the Yemenite MS. of Mo'ed Kaṭon, with the exception of the above gloss, some time ago. See the Yemenite MS. of Mo'ed Kaṭon in the Library of Columbia University, Leipzig, 1920.

² I described the entire MSS of Pesahim, Megillah, and Mo'ed Kaṭon in the introduction to my Doctor's theses at Columbia University in 1917.

(a) One of the marginal notes on p. 4 of the manuscript commenting on the word from the Gemara בריין (M.K. 4b), reads ואותו הכרול שבו חופרין סביבות האילן שמו ברידי ובלשון פרסי קורין אותו בננא. This word בננא is perhaps connected with the Sanscrit *bhañy*, 'to break,' *bhavaga*, 'a breaking, rupture,' Old Irish, *comboing*, *confrigit*.

(b) The manuscript reading for the phrase אִיחִימָא³ וְאִיחִימָא רַב כְּהֵנָּה נִיחֵוָה as it occurs in our edition of the Talmud וְאִיחִימָא רַב כְּהֵנָּה אִמְל' נִיחֵוָה. The marginal note⁴ in the manuscript which explains the word נִיחֵוָה reads כִּי נִיחֵוָה לִשָּׁן פֶּרְסִי וְהוּא חֲפִירָה שְׁעוֹשֵׁן אוֹתוֹ הַכּוֹבֵסִין. The form נִיחֵוָה seems to be very doubtful. It, however, might suggest to one, Avesta, *vidatū* (also the form *vidotū*), a demon who was 'a divider'—at least for the first part of this word, i.e. נִיחֵ. While there are no noun forms in Iranian which would seem to favour the explanation of נִיחֵ, the following forms, however, might be taken into consideration, **vidvaka* or *vidavaka*, but the base of *vidatū* is *dya*, 'to bind.'

The manuscript reading for the word לאכונגרי as it occurs in our edition of the Talmud is⁵ לאכונגרי. The marginal reading of the manuscript which serves as an explanation of this word reads פֶּא אַכְנַנְרִי נֵא אַכְוֹנְרִי פ' מִסְדְּרִין שְׁלַחְנוֹת לַמַּעֲבָד עֲבִירֵיהֶוּ וְאֵם נִשְׁחַבְרָה רִגְלָהּ שְׁלַחְנוֹ שְׁרִי לַחֲקוּנָה פֶּא בַחֲשׁוֹבוֹת אַכְוֹנְרִי הוּא כַּמְמוֹנָה עַל שְׁלַחְנוֹ הַמָּלַךְ, שְׁשֻׁלְחַן בִּלְשָׁן פֶּרְסִי אַבּוּאן, וְהַמָּלַךְ נִזְרִי.⁶

The form אַבּוּאן suggests Persian *aouan*, 'solutio pretii' in *Codex Cumanicus*, ed. Knun, 106,308. The text here doubtless refers to the Persian آوان in Vullers, *Lex. Pers.*

The form נִזְרִי is probably Old Persian,* *vazriyā*, 'powerful,' cf. Old Persian *vazarka*, 'great'; for the 1 cf. *Pasand guzurd*, 'great,' equal Persian نَزْ (Hubsehman, *Per. Stud.*, 29).

New York.

JULIUS J. PRICE.

Θεοδιδάκτοι.

A SUGGESTION OF AN IMPLICATION OF THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

IN 1 Th 4⁹ St. Paul tells his Gentile converts αἱτοῖς ἀπὸ ὑμῶν θεοδιδάκτοι ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν

³ M.K. 8b. ⁴ This is found in our MS. on p. 10.

⁵ M.K. 12a.

⁶ This is found in our MS. on p. 16.

ἀλλήλους, 'for ye yourselves have been taught of God to love another.' Milligan (*ad loc.*) understands this to point not so much to one divine communication as to a divine relationship between believers and God inducing love, and quotes Calvin, '*quia divinitus edocti sint*, quo significat insculptam esse eorum cordibus caritatem, ut supervacuae sint literae in charta scriptae'; and Bengel, 'doctrinae divinae vis confluit in amorem.'

I venture to suggest that St. Paul refers to a direct divine teaching given to persons from whom, or on the authority of whose writings, he had learnt it, and had communicated it to his Thessalonian converts. To what could he be referring but Jn 13³⁴? It is the familiar: ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, κ.τ.λ. In the margin of the 1927 Nestle's New Testament, Jn 13³⁴ is noted against 1 Th 4⁹, and in the margin of Jn 13³⁴ is noted Jn 15¹², αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ ἣ ἐμὴ ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, κ.τ.λ. There is no other New Testament saying chronologically prior to the Thessalonian letter, but the Johannine one attributed to Jesus. St. Paul either had been taught this in the earliest Christian circles in which he moved after his Damascus experience, or had had access to a collection of the sayings of Jesus containing the new commandment. Had he an Aramaic copy of the Fourth Gospel? Whether or not, it is submitted that θεοδιδάκτοί in 1 Th 4⁹ refers to the teaching of Jesus in Jn 13³⁴ and 15¹², and that Jesus is the Θεὸς who is the author of the teaching of loving one another. The Teacher Himself calls it 'new,' and copyrights it with the imprimatur, 'my commandment.'

The word Θεοδιδάκτοί (occurring in the New Testament in 1 Th. alone) is built on the analogy of the Homeric αὐτοδίδακτος (*Odyssey*, 22³⁴⁷, 991) and has other classical parallels for its formation, Θεοβλαβής (Hrdt. 1²⁷ 813⁷) Θεογενής (Sophoc., *Antig.*, 894), Θεόγονος (Eurip., *Or.* 346).

In each case the agency or instrumentality is stressed. In the case of Θεοδιδάκτοί the Versions have unanimously brought out the directness of the agency. Thus the A.V. 'taught of God'; so R.V. both English and the American; Moffatt, 'taught by God'; German, *von Gott gelehret*; Italian, *insegnati da Dio*; French, *appris de Dieu*; Spanish, *aprendisteis de Dios*; etc. etc. So the Syriac and the Vulgate. The Hebrew New Testament of Delitzsch has יהוה לְפָנָי (imminude Jehovah), recalling the Old Testament background (Is 54¹³) of the expression διδάκτοί Θεοῦ in Jn 6⁴⁵.

T. ISAAC TAMBYAH.

Jaffna, Ceylon.

The Meaning of μέν οὖν in Acts xiv. 3.

IN his article on 'The Original Position of Acts 14³' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for August, 1929, Professor J. Hugh Michael writes: 'If v.³ is in its right place, we should have expected it to open with "yet," not with "therefore." And he cannot admit Weymouth's rendering of μέν οὖν by 'yet,' declaring that there is no authority for it. We, however, believe that Weymouth's or some other rendering can be justified. In Moulton-Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (Part v., p. 466a), it is stated that οὖν may possess a slightly adversative sense, reference being made to a Papyrus, dated 73 B.C., in which the term is used in the sense of 'howbeit.' The reader is asked to compare Ac 25⁴ 28⁵. In the former of these passages μέν οὖν is rendered 'howbeit' by R.V., and 'however' by Weymouth, but Moffatt apparently leaves the word untranslated; in the latter passage R.V. and Weymouth render the term as before, and Moffatt gives 'however.' Such a rendering would give the sense required in this verse.

But another rendering is possible and, perhaps, more likely. Often in Classical Greek and sometimes in N.T.—certainly in Lk 11²⁸, and possibly in Jn 20³⁰—μέν οὖν has the meaning of 'nay rather,' modifying or correcting what has been said or supposed. This, we think, is the meaning intended in this verse. We are presented with a picture of the undaunted courage, faith, and determination of the Apostles. The author of the passage, it seems to us, says this: 'Did the Apostles yield their ground and retire from the work in the teeth of such opposition? So far from that, nay rather—much as you might have expected otherwise—they actually spent a considerable time there, speaking freely and resting on the Lord, who vindicated their faith and audacity.'

We can plead authority for both renderings; and, incidentally, if either be approved, any assumption that this verse is out of its original position seems to us to fall to the ground.

DOUGLAS S. SHARP.

North Shields.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.